

# The Classical Review

JULY 1905.

## THE MANCHESTER AND DISTRICT BRANCH OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION.

AT the invitation of the Editor of this Review I am glad to give a brief report of the formation and work of this Branch of the Classical Association. The success it has had, which has greatly exceeded expectation, will perhaps encourage similar developments in other places and may be of some interest to readers of the *Classical Review* as showing the strength of the hold which Classical studies possess in a typical centre of modern industrial life.

The first step was taken by the Classical Society of the present and past students of the Manchester University (in which the older Owens College is now absorbed), by inviting several hundred people resident in the district and likely to be interested to hear a lecture given on Nov. 15, 1904 by Prof. R. M. Burrows of Cardiff on 'The Art of Translation,' the Vice-Chancellor of the University presiding. At the close of the lecture, which aroused great interest, a resolution establishing the Branch was carried with enthusiasm. The list of the officers appointed at this and the following meeting is as follows :

*President:*

Prof. A. S. WILKINS, LL.D., Litt.D.

*Vice-Presidents:*

The Right Rev. THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER; The Right Rev. THE BISHOP OF SALFORD; Prof. W. BOYD DAWKINS, F.R.S., D.Sc.; Miss S. A. BURSTALL, B.A.; E. DONNER, Esq., B.A.; the Rev. CANON HICKS, M.A.; the Very Rev. DEAN MACLURE, D.D., Hon. LL.D.; the Rev. J. H. MOULTON, D.Lit.; J. L. PATON, Esq. M.A.; Prof. M. SADLER, M.A., Hon. LL.D.; Prof. J. STRACHAN,

NO. CLXX. VOL. XIX.

LL.D.; A. HOPKINSON, Esq., M.A., Hon. LL.D., K.C. (Vice-Chancellor of the Victoria University); the Ven. ARCHDEACON WILSON, D.D.

*Hon. Treasurer:*

H. WILLIAMSON, Esq., M.A.

*Committee:*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D. (*Chairman*); W. B. ANDERSON, Esq., M.A.; Miss H. A. ASHWORTH, B.A.; H. GUPPY, Esq. M.A.; JOS. HALL, Esq., Litt.D.; Miss C. HERFORD; C. E. MONTAGUE, Esq., M.A.; G. NORWOOD, Esq., B.A.; C. E. G. SPENCER, Esq.; E. SUTTON, Esq., B.A.; Miss M. TAPLEN; E. S. WARMAN, Esq., M.A.; Miss D. LIMEBEER, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*).

Besides professed teachers of Classics the list includes a distinguished group of clergy of different denominations, the leader of the Common Law Bar in the circuit, five Heads of important secondary schools, one of the senior leader-writers of the *Manchester Guardian*, the John Rylands Librarian, and several eminent members of the University Senate and Council, interested though no longer engaged in Classical study. The support of the veteran geologist and antiquarian Professor Boyd Dawkins has proved of particular value.

The constitution of the Branch was adopted at the first regular meeting held in December, at which a paper was read, and followed by a discussion, upon 'The personality of Cicero.' One or two points in the organisation should perhaps be mentioned. Membership is either Regular (with a subscription of 7s. 6d.) or Associate (with a subscription of 2s. 6d.), the former including full membership of the parent Association,

the latter admitting to local privileges only. In eight months the membership has grown to about 180 (of whom about 84 are regular members, the remainder Associates); and it is hoped that it may be steadily increased by the adhesion of Classical students leaving the University to enter professional life. Both classes of members are pledged to the principles of the Association, which, I hope at least, are too familiar to readers of this Review to need recital here; the third 'object' was, however, localised as follows at the suggestion of Canon E. L. Hicks, the well-known editor of the *Inscriptions of Cos*:

- '(c) To encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries on all sides of Classical studies, and especially to promote the excavation, study, and preservation of the remains of the Roman occupation of the district.'

In order to carry out this in a practical shape an Excavation Committee was formed consisting of the Chairman and two other members of the General Committee, with Canon Hicks, Professors Boyd Dawkins and Tait (Professor of Ancient and Mediaeval History in the University), Mr. John Henry Hopkinson (formerly Craven Student), and as Hon. Secretary Mr. F. A. Bruton, of the Manchester Grammar School, who has made a special study of the numerous Roman sites in the district. Before passing to describe the excavation now in progress, I should mention the two other very successful meetings held by the Branch, one at the Rylands Library when Mr. Guppy told the story of the famous Althorp Collection and showed a large number of its early editions (including copies of the *Editio Princeps* of eighteen Greek and Latin authors) besides other rarities now in his keeping; and one at the University, where Professor Ridgeway lectured last month to a large audience on 'The Origin of Greek Tragedy.' The arrangements for next winter include lectures by Professor Butcher and Canon Hicks and a discussion on 'The Teaching of Ancient History.'

The first work of the Excavation Committee was to negotiate a treaty of friendly relations with the Antiquarian Society of Glossop (a branch of the Derbyshire Archaeological Society). This body some three years ago, with great enterprise, had leased from Lord Howard of Glossop and protected by good fencing the site of a

Roman camp known locally as 'Melandra Castle'—the origin of the name has not yet been traced back further than Watkins' *Roman Cheshire*. The heavy cost of the fencing, added to the expenses of three weeks' excavation, ably conducted in 1902 for the local Committee by Mr. John Garstang now of the University of Liverpool, had reduced their work to a complete standstill, save for the private digging of their Secretary, Mr. Robert Hamnett, to whose devoted work is due the excellent preservation of many very interesting relics which have come to light, and which are shortly to be permanently housed in the Glossop Free Library in cases provided by Lord Howard of Glossop. The most interesting of these relics are perhaps the pottery (Samian, Castor and Upchurch), the Roman glass, a complete set of weights, some fragments of dried 'Mare's-tail,' a tough, smooth plant which the soldiers must have used for bedding, a fine signet copied from the first (sphinx) seal of Augustus, and a curious clay model of a horse, with what I am told by archaeologists is an almost, if not quite, unique specimen of an *ephippion*, of course equally in miniature, attached to the horse originally by strings. The Centurial inscription (long known, but only now in safe custody) shows that the camp was built by the First Cohort of *Frisiauones*, who from other epigraphical evidence are known to have built also *Mancunium* and to have been attached to the XX legion at Chester at all events in 105 A.D. The coins found are numerous, the earliest is one of Galba, the latest one of Carausius, the insubordinate Admiral of the Roman-British fleet whom Diocletian was forced to acknowledge as a colleague in 289 A.D. It is a problem of great interest to date the camp more narrowly, but I must not yet enter into any of the many different aspects of the question. The site has been visited by both Mr. F. Haverfield and Prof. Ridgeway, who although they have of course taken no responsibility, have materially aided the work by their valuable counsel. And though it has no direct connection with the Association, I may perhaps mention that on the invitation of the Council of the University Mr. Haverfield gave a masterly lecture to Classical and Historical students on 'The Roman occupation of Derbyshire.'

The results of the excavation, which a subscription of some £70<sup>1</sup> will enable us to

<sup>1</sup> This includes a grant of £25 from the University and £2 2s. from the Council of the parent Association.

continue all through the summer, will be fully described in the First Report, which will be published for the Branch, probably by the Manchester University Press, in the autumn, and will contain, besides plans and photographs, special articles on different questions by members of the Excavation Committee and others. In the vacation the work will progress more rapidly, as two members of the Committee will be in continuous charge for a month with a larger number of workmen. So far the work has been directed mainly to clearing the foundations of the walls, gates and towers.

In conclusion I should like to point out

that the Committee has been enabled, thanks to the kindness and enthusiasm of its Honorary Secretary, to put the Excavation to real educational use. Besides visits and lectures for members of the Branch and students of the University, parties from no less than seven secondary schools, and two or three Archaeological Societies have been taken round the camp, and I do not think any one has been there who has not learnt to feel a real interest in this visible and tangible monument of the first civilising power in Britain.

R. S. CONWAY.

June 20, 1905.

#### ON *ILIAS* I. 418.—A REJOINDER.

414 ὦ μοι, τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ  
τεκοῖσα;  
αἴθ' ὄφελες παρὰ νησὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ  
ἀπίγνων  
ἥθει, ἐτέί νι τοι αἴσα μίννινθά περ, οὐ τι  
μάλι δῆν.  
νῦν δ' ἄμα τ' ὀκύμορος καὶ ὀιζυρὸς περὶ  
πάντων  
418 ἐπλεο· τῶ σε κακῆι αἴσηι τέκον ἐν μεγά-  
ροισιν.

The tone of Mr. Earle's reply is decidedly discourteous, but I am willing to believe that it may be unintentionally so and only his way of expressing disagreement. Moreover the greater part of what he has written is irrelevant to the issue, which is simply whether *τῶ* in 418 means 'therefore' and makes good sense. I never thought anything of *τῶ*, but I did not thoroughly realise the weakness of the conjecture until Mr. Earle undertook its defence. I make the following remarks upon Mr. Earle's reply.

1. One of Mr. Earle's points is that I said that *τῶ* has the approval of Dr. Leaf. True: and it was chiefly Dr. Leaf's approval that caused me to write my note.

2. Mr. Earle says that, with my translation, I am 'logically obliged' to refer *κακῆι αἴσηι* in E 209 not to Pandarus himself but to his bow. He is mistaken. Whether we translate *κακῆι αἴσηι* in A 418 'to an ill lot (or fortune or fate)' and refer to Achilles, or we translate 'with an ill lot (or fortune or fate)' and refer to Thetis (and each view has its advocates) it makes no difference to the parallelism of A 418 with E 209 and τ 259

as regards the reference of *τῶ*. In all three places the predicate is *κακῆι αἴσηι* and the justification of *τῶ* is to be found not in the preceding line but a little further back. No doubt if we take *κακῆι αἴσηι* of A 418 to refer to Thetis, the subject of the verb, the parallelism with E 209 and τ 259 is closer than if we refer these two words to Achilles, and that fact is *pro tanto* a reason for taking them in the former way. On the other hand the reference to Achilles is favoured by *αἴσα* in l. 416, as Dr. Leaf points out.

3. Mr. Earle writes, 'the *ρά* in E 209 clearly shows that *τῶ* means "therefore." There is no *ρά* in A 418.' By this is meant that it is not certain that *τῶ* in A 418 = 'therefore' because it is not followed by *ρά*: but in cases too numerous to quote *τῶ* by itself does mean 'therefore,' and, as 'therefore' gives excellent sense in A 418, why make any change by reading *τῶς*?

4. Mr. Earle says that 'I admit that his remark about A 418 is true.' I do nothing of the kind, as his own quotation of my words shows, and would show more clearly if he had also given the next sentence which was, "The true predicate is not *τέκον* but *κακῆι αἴσηι* and the sense is 'therefore to an ill lot' it was that I bore thee (as I now know)." I am not concerned to deny that his *translation* 'therefore ill-starred did I bring thee forth in the hall' may be taken in an *orthodox* sense. But his objection to *τῶ* shows that he does not so take it.

5. Finally, I am informed that I do not know the meaning of *αἴσα* because I translate it 'lot.' By 'lot' I mean 'lot in life,'

'fortune,' 'fate.' Messrs. Lang, Leaf and Myers translate *ἀλο* by 'lot' in l. 416, Monroe translates *κακήν αἰσχη* 'with evil fortune' and Ameis 'zu einem schlimmen Lose.' At any rate I err in good company. But Mr. Earle tells us that *ἀλο* when used

of human life = 'doom.' Let us apply this to l. 416, 'seeing that thy *doom* is very brief and endureth no long while.' What an improvement!

R. C. SEATON.

### NOTES ON HERODOTUS, BOOKS I-III.

#### BOOK I.

24. 81. *τελευτέοντος δὲ τοῦ νόμου ρίψαι μιν*  
*ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν.*

Probably *τελευτέοντα* with the genitive, a well established construction. Herwerden *τελευτήσαντα*, but the present is both nearer to the MSS and better in itself, *just as he finished.*

ib. 11 *ιστορέονθαι* (not elsewhere used in the passive by H.) should perhaps be changed to *ιστορέων*, going on from the *ἔχειν* of the sentence before. So in 3. 99. 2 (for instance) R has *διαφθίρειν* against the *διαφθίρεσθαι* of other MSS. Valckenaer proposed *εἰρωτέονθαι* here. Dr. Postgate suggests to me that *ιστορέονθαι* may be middle. This is possible, but H.'s frequent and consistent use of the active is against it.

27. 4 *νησιώτας δὲ τί δοκεῖς εὐχεσθαι ἄλλο*  
*ἢ . . . λαβεῖν ἄρασθαι Λυδὸν ἐν θαλάσσῃ;*  
*(MSS ἄρασθαι or ἄρώμενοι)*

Stein reads the ungrammatical and surely impossible nominative *ἄρώμενοι*. The infinitive is less anomalous, but still awkward. Should we not read *ἄρασθαι*, but omit *εὐχεσθαι*, which may have been put in to fill up the ellipse of *τί δοκεῖς ἄλλο* *ἢ ἄρασθαι*? Cobet approves Toup's conjecture *ἀιώρε-*  
*μένοντος* as answering to *νησιώτας ἵππενομένοντος* *ἐν ἡπέρω* just before, and it is certainly plausible.

32. 6 *πᾶν ἄνθρωπος συμφορή.*

Quotations and A<sup>2</sup> (Stein) give *πᾶς*. The parallels in Stein's note point to *πᾶσα*, e.g. Ar. Ach. 909 *μικός γε μάκος οὐτος*. Δ. ἀλλ' *ἄπαν κακόν*: Theocr. 15. 148 *χῶντος ὅξος ἄπαν*.

48. 3 *διέπεμψε παρὰ τὰ χρηστήρια τοὺς θεο-*  
*πρόποντος.*

*παρά* (which we should expect to take a

<sup>1</sup> In default of any way universally adopted of referring to specific parts of chapters, I have cited the sections as given in the old *Oxford Pocket Classics*.

personal accusative), probably because the oracle is more or less identified with the god or hero. Thus in 46. 2 *ἐς Δελφούς, ἐς Δωδώνην, παρά τε Ἀμφίστρων καὶ παρὰ Τροφώνιον.* But *περὶ τὰ χ.* is possible.

59. 1 *τούτων δὴ ὁν τῶν ἔθνεων τὸ μὲν*  
*Ἀττικὸν κατεχόμενον τε καὶ διεσπασμένον*  
*ἐπινθάνετο ὁ Κροῖτος ὑπὸ Πεισιστράτου.*

As *ὑπό* has nothing to do with *διεσπασμένον*, Herwerden reads *τέως* for *τε καὶ* and has also suggested *τέως διεσπασμένον κατεχόμενον*. We might very well adopt the transposition and read *διεσπασμένον τε καὶ κατεχόμενον*. The Athenians were divided and were under the control of P.

ib. 4 *οὐκ ὁν . . . πείθεσθαι ἔθελεν . . .*  
*γενέσθαι <δε> οἱ κ.τ.λ.?*

65. 5 *ἄλλ' ἔτι καὶ μᾶλλον θεὸν ἔλπομαι, ὁ*  
*Διοκόρηγος.*

The oracle is in doubt whether to call him god or man. It is hard to see the force of *ἔτι*. Perhaps *ἄλλα τι*. Both *καὶ* and *τι* are sometimes added to *μᾶλλον*.

67. 4 *"Εστι τις Ἀρκαδίης Τεγέη λευρῷ ἐν*  
*χώρῳ,*  
*ἐνθέντεις πνείουσι δύο κρατερῆς ὑπ'*  
*ἀνάγκης.*

It is surprising that exception has not been taken to the first of these lines. Not only does it make the *ἐνθέντεις πνείουσι* refer to Tegea as a whole, when it ought to be more specific, but the famous city is spoken of as *Τεγέη τις* in a slighting manner. Surely it stands to reason that we want 'there is a spot in Tegea where' etc. For the natural expression cf. Herodotus' own way of writing: 160. 4 *χῶρος τῆς Μυσίου*: 2. 75. 1 *ἔστι δὲ χῶρος τῆς Ἀραβίης.*

The *excerpta* from Diodorus actually give *Τεγέης*, which we should like to make depend on *χῶρος*, but this is impossible without some further change. We might think of *Τεγέη λευρὸς ἐνι χῶρος*. The corruption however is not a likely one, and *χῶρω* no doubt comes

from *Od.* 7. 123 τῆς ἔτερον μὲν θειλόπεδον λευρῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ. I suggest therefore that we should read ἔστι τοι Ἀρκαδίν Τεγέης λευρῷ ἐνὶ χώρῳ ἐνθ' ἄνεμοι κ.τ.λ., joining ἔστι with ἐνθα, as in *Xen. Cyrop.* 7. 4. 15 ἔστιν ἐνθα ισχυρῶν ὀφελοῦστ σφενδονῆται. The common Latin *Arcaean* seems to guarantee the use of Ἀρκαδίος as an adjective.

*ib.* 6 οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοεργοί εἰσι <οἱ> τῶν ἀστῶν ἔξιντες ἐκ τῶν ιππέων αἱὲ οἱ πρεσβύταροι?

The article cannot, I think, be dispensed with. The order of the words (instead of τῶν ἀστῶν οἱ ἐ. or οἱ ἐ. τ. ἀ.) has many parallels in H., e.g. 53. 3 τοὺς δὲ Ἑλλήνων διαταράτους: 3. 26. 1 οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπ' Ἀμανίον ἀποσταλέτες.

77. 1 (or 76. 5) καὶ τὰ μὲν στρατόπεδα ἀμφότερα οὐτῶς ἡγωνίσατο.

Write in accordance with H.'s practice ἡγωνίστο.

78. 2 ἐς τῶν ἔξηγητέων Τελμησσέων cannot be right, because with such a genitive we can only supply a word like *house* or *temple*, a building, not a country or tract of country. Perhaps τὴν has been lost before τῶν. Qy. ἐς τὴν τῶν Τ. τῶν ἐ? Or ἐς τὴν τῶν Τ., omitting ἔξηγητέων? Scheer proposed ἐς Τελμησσέων, omitting τῶν ἐ., and so too Herwerden.

84. 3 Τελμησσέων δικασάντων being ludicrously unsuitable, surely we should accept Reiske's διδαξάντων, or possibly δεξάντων. The notion needed is that of instruction and information. In 6. 139. 3 again δικάσωτο is wrong and has been corrected by Cobet to δικαιώστο.

90. 2 Κροῖσε, ἀναρτημένον σεῦ ἀνδρὸς βασιλέος χρηστὰ ἔργα καὶ ἔπεια ποιέειν, αἴτεο δόσιν ἥντινα βούλεαί τοι γενέσθαι παραντίκα.

There are here at least three difficulties: (1) the genitive absolute referring to the subject of αἴτεο (this however) is trifling; (2) the pointless description of Croesus as ἀνήρ βασιλεύς, which has no bearing on the case and has indeed also ceased to be true; (3) ἀναρτημένον ποιέειν when ποιήσαντος would be more suitable. Dobree partially restored the passage when he read σε for σοῦ, thus making ἀνδρὸς β. refer to Cyrus, which is obviously the meaning. Cyrus is ready (ἀναρτημένος) to reward Croesus. But, apart from the zeugma ἔπεια ποιέειν (more awkward than 3. 135. 1 ἀμα ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἔτοίτε, because there ἔποίτε follows immediately on ἔργα), where is the suitability of χρηστὰ ἔπεια here at all? It is a practical

reward that Cyrus wishes to bestow, a δόσις. He does not ask, What would you like me to say of you? I take it then the χρηστὰ ἔργα καὶ ἔπεια must somehow be those of Croesus, the good counsel and services for which the king wishes to make a return. Did H. write something like ἀναρτημένον σε εὖ ἀνδρὸς βασιλέος <διὰ> χρηστὰ ἔργα καὶ ἔπεια ποιέειν? It might be a participle that has been lost. There is, I think, no objection to the long separation of εὖ and ποιέειν.

105. 5 ὥστε ἄμα λέγοντί τε οἱ Σκύθαι διὰ τούτο σφέας νοεῖσιν καὶ ὄραν παρ' ἐννοοῦσι τοὺς ἀπικνεομένους ἐς τὴν Σκυθικὴν χώρην ὡς διακέαται.

This may be right, but it seems odd that the last part should be stated as an assertion of the Scythians. One would expect something like καὶ ὄραν πάρα (or πάρεστιν or παρέχει) αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι ἀπικνεομένοισι κ.τ.λ. (Madvig has suggested πάρεστι τοῖσι without αὐτοῖσι.)

116. 3 ἔγω ταῦτα ποίησω ὥστε σὲ καὶ τὸν παῖδα τὸν σὸν μηδὲν ἐπιμέμφεσθαι.

ταῦτα, one would think, ought to be τοιαῦτα, but the same question arises several times in Herodotus' text.

132. 4 μάγος ἀνήρ παρεστεῶς ἐπαείδει θεογονίην οἵην δὴ ἐκεῖνοι λέγοντο εἶναι τὴν ἐπαοιδὴν.

If it was always a θεογονίη, why add οἵην δὴ κ.τ.λ.? Nor does the thing seem very appropriate in itself. Is θεογονίη an adscript? Certainly we should not miss it, if omitted. [I see now that Madvig has argued partly to the same effect in *Advers.* 3. 23.]

137. 1 μήτε αὐτὸν τὸν βασιλέα μηδένα φονεύειν μήτε τὸν ἄλλων Περσέων μηδένα τῶν ἐωτοῦ οἰκετῶν ἀνήκεστον πάθος ἔρδειν.

It is impossible to accept Stein's view that μηδένα does double duty, both with Περσέων and with οἰκετῶν. Herwerden seems on the right track when in his appendix he proposes to insert a τινά. But I hardly think τινά could stand after μήτε, as he suggests. μήτε τινά . . . μηδένα . . . πάθος ἔρδειν is to my mind doubtful Greek. Rather μήτε τ. ἀ. Π. μηδένα τῶν <τινά> ἐαντοῦ οἰκετῶν. Or we might insert another μηδένα before τῶν ἐωτοῦ.

141. 3 Fable of the piper and the fish. παιστόθε μοι ὄρχεομενοι, ἔτει οὐδὲ ἐμέο αἰλέοτος ἥθελετε ἐκβαίνειν ὄρχεομενοι.

Anybody's ear can tell him that the

occurrence of ὄρχεόμενοι at the end of two successive clauses is wrong. Moreover the fish would not come out of the water dancing: they would come out and then dance on the shore. Hence Herwerden brackets the word and Cobet wished to read ὄρχηστομενοι. I would rather suggest ἐκβαίνοντες (or possibly ἐκβάντες, but the aorist is not necessary) ὄρχεσθαι. A good many instances can be got together of two words, as it were, exchanging terminations in this sort of way. Confining myself to verbs and participles, I find in this same book 192, 3 the MSS varying between ή δὲ ἀράβη μέτρον ἐν Περσικὸν χωρέει κ.τ.λ. and μέτρον ἐστὶ Π. χωρέον, while in 2, 64, 6 they vary between ἐπιλέγοντες ποιεῖσθαι and ποιεῦντες ἐπιλέγονται. In Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 20 Dobree's ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸ βάραβρον ἐμβληθέντα seems right for the ἀποθανόντα . . . ἐμβληθῆναι of the MSS. In the following cases the confusion is easier. *Iliad* 8, 526 Aristarchus read εἴχομαι ἐλπόμενος, Zenodotus ἔλπομαι εὐχόμενος. *Od.* 17, 245 one MS has ιθρίζεις φορέων for ιθρίζων φορέεις. *Ar. Ach.* 91 R has ἥκοντες ἄγομεν in spite of metre for ἄγοντες ἥκομεν, and it is fairly certain that in *Wasps* 577 τάγαθα . . . ἄχεις φάσκων should be ἄχων φάσκεις, very probable that *Thesm.* 314 φανέντας ἐπιχαρῆναι should be χαρέντας ἐπιχαρῆναι. *Plato Alcib.* 2 (beginning) προσενέδόμενος πορεύειν is a safe correction of πορεύμενος προσενέζειν. Cf. Rohde's suggestion in *Symp.* 174 D, πορεύμενον ὑπολειτεῖναι for πορεύεσθαι ὑπολειτόμενον. *Ajax* 1183 the MSS give μολὼ . . . μελρέεις, but the *Elym. M.* has μολώ . . . μελρῶ. The change I would make has therefore plenty of parallels, though it is rather more considerable than most of them. Cf. below on 2, 51, 1.

152, 4 ἐπειπτον . . . ἀπερέοντα Κύρω Λακεδαιμονίων ῥῆσιν . . . μηδεμίαν πόλιν σιναμώρειν.

Cobet demurs to ῥῆσιν and would read ῥήμασι in the sense, I presume, of 'speaking on behalf of' or 'conveying their command.' But that seems an awkward expression. Does not ῥῆσιν stand for ἀπόρρησιν according to the Greek practice of using the simple word rather than repeat the compound (ἀπερέοντα)? ἀπερέοντα Λ. δ. then is to prohibit him in a prohibition coming from the Lacedaemonians. H. might have said ἀπαγγελέοντα Λ. ἀπόρρησιν. Or ῥῆσιν may be actually a mistake for ἀπόρρησιν, as in 7, 10, 3 ἡγόρευον probably is for ἀπηγόρευον.

160, 4 ἔξεδοσαν δὲ οἱ Χῖοι (Πακτύν) ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀταρνέοι μισθῷ, τοῦ δὲ Ἀταρνέος τούτου ἐστὶ χῶρος τῆς Μυσίης.

The last words are usually taken as a violent anacoluthon, but even so there is nothing to account for the genitive. What was he going to say? Should we not rather suppose something lost, e.g. a verb to the effect that they wanted Atarneus? Of course more words than one must be missing. It is hardly satisfactory just to substitute with Krüger δὲ Ἀταρνέος.

186, 6 Nitocris built a stone bridge in Babylon, ἐπιτείνεσκε δὲ ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅκος μὲν ἡμέρα γένοιτο, ξύλα τετράγωνα, ἐπ' ὧν τὴν διάβασιν ἐποιεῖντο οἱ Βαθυλάνιοι τὰς δὲ νύκτας τὰ ξύλα ταῦτα ἀπαιρέεσκον, so that they could not cross.

Inherent probability and the plural ἀπαιρέεσκον make it pretty certain that H. wrote ἐπετείνεσκον. It was not by Nitocris or by orders from her twice a day that the banks were placed and removed.

190, 4 χρόνον τε ἔγγιγνομένου συχνοῦ ἀντέρω τε οὐδὲν τῶν πρηγμάτων προκοπτομένων.

Comparing *S. 356, 1* ἐσ τὸ πρόσω τε οὐδὲν προεκόπτετο, we shall be inclined to read προκοπτόμενον.

195, 1 περιβάλλεται for περιβαλλόμενος? If the latter, which is in itself awkward, were right, the following participle ought to have a τε or δέ or καί. Madvig's ἐπενδύνεται καί does not remove this objection, and ἐπενδύνομαι is a dubious form.

196, 5 καὶ ταῦτην ἀνεκήρυσσε, ὅστις θέλοι ἀλόχιστον χρυσίον λαβῶν συνουκέειν αὐτὴν . . . τὸ δὲ ἀν χρυσίον ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῶν εὐθέων παρθένων.

ἀν is in a strange place and should, I have little doubt, be δῆ. χρυσίον . . . τὸ δὲ δῆ χρυσίον is the regular turn of phrase. Hermann suggested τὸ δὲ αὐτόν.

198, 9 The words ἵνα μὴ ἀδικοῖεν (read ἀδικούειν) . . . ἄγονται make no sense and are omitted by Stein, Cobet, and Herwerden. They would however do well enough if put four or five lines earlier after οὐτών ἀπαγγέλεονται. The γενέσθαι preceding them is retained by Stein, omitted by Cobet and Herwerden. The latter seem right, but γενέσθαι may be the remains of ἀπαγγέλεον, if my suggestion is sound.

207, 9 Μασταγέται εἰσὶν ἀγαθῶν τε Περσικῶν ἀπειροι καὶ καλῶν μεγάλων ἀπαθέες.

Herwerden's κακῶν for καλῶν should certainly be adopted. (1) The antithesis of ἀγαθῶν and κακά is much better than the rather unmeaning combination of ἀγαθά and

καλά: (2) ἀπαθῆς κακῶν occurs several times in H., whereas ἀ. καλῶν is a questionable phrase altogether: (3) the mistake is a very common one.

ib. 12 Perhaps λείψεται for λείπεται, agreeing in tense with τρέψονται. It is not strictly necessary, but the mistake is extremely common.

210. 2 In the reverse way I have sometimes thought we should read μὴ ἔη . . . ὅτις τοι ἐπιβούλευε instead of ἐπιβούλευσει, as the question is of there being someone plotting at that moment. But here again the tense may pass. Stein after Krüger ἐπιβούλευσει, a change not worth making. [Dr. Postgate points out that there is very good authority for ἐπιβούλευε. Stein's note in his critical edition is 'ἐπιβούλευε B<sup>1</sup> R, ἐπιβούλευοι d 2.]

## BOOK II.

2. 4 παιδία δύο . . . διδοῦ ποιμένι τρέφειν ἐς τὰ ποίμνια.

ἐς τὰ π. is wanting in construction. Perhaps ἀγοντι has been lost.

Just above in Ψαμμήτιχος δέ the δέ should perhaps be γάρ.

3. 4 τὰ μὲν νῦν θεῖα τῶν ἀπηγμάτων οὐαὶ ἥκουν οὐκ εἰμὶ πρόθυμος ἐξηγέεσθαι . . . ὅτα δὲ ἀνθρωπία πρήγματα κ.τ.λ.

οἰα should probably be ὅτα. Observe the ὅτα following. A common mistake.

5. 1 δῆλα γάρ δὴ . . . ὅτι Αἴγυπτος ἐς τὴν Ἑλλήνες ναυτίλλονται ἐστι Αἴγυπτίοισι ἐπίκτηρός τε γῆ καὶ δῶρον ποταμοῦ, καὶ τὰ κατύπερθε ἔτι τῆς λίμνης ταίτης . . . τῆς πέρι ἕκενοι οὐδὲν ἔτι τοιώνδε ἔλεγον.

(1) The Egypt to which the Greeks sailed did not include τὰ κατύπερθε. I conclude therefore that these words are not an accusative, as Stein makes them, but a further subject of ἔστι. If this is so, we seem to want <καὶ> Αἴγυπτος or Αἴγυπτός τε. It would at any rate smooth the construction. (2) It is difficult to believe that τῆς can be used with reference to τὰ κ.χώρη. Has an original τῶν been corrupted to τῆς through the influence of λίμνης?

8. 1 τῇ μὲν γάρ τῆς Ἀραβίης οὐρος παρατέταται . . . 3. τὸ δὲ πρὸς Λιβύης τῆς Αἴγυπτου οὐρος ἀλλο κ.τ.λ.

Stein joins τῆς Ἀραβίης and τῆς Αἴγυπτου with οὐρος. But the expression is very

unlikely, and in 3 it is clear that the genitive depends on τὸ πρός Λ., as Krüger says. Perhaps πρός has dropped out before τῆς Ἀραβίης. This is more likely than that we should read πρός for τῇ, as we also might.

32. 6 ἔπει has been corrected in various ways. I do not find any suggestion that it is itself right, but that an infinitive dependent on it (*after they started*) has been lost. This is a possibility not to be ignored.

39. 4 For μέλλοι read μέλλει with R. The optative is not really suitable.

43. 3 I should concur with Herwerden in omitting οὖτοι, if I saw why anyone should have interpolated it. Perhaps αὐτοί.

44. 1 ἡ δέ (στήλη) σμαράγδον λίθον λάμποντος τὰς νύκτας μέγαθος.

*Dubitabundus conieci εἰμεγάθεος vel μεγάθεος μεγάλον.* Cf. 1. 51. *An μεγάλως!* says Herwerden, and Krüger in his very useful edition of 1866 'μέγαθος kann für μεγάλως nicht stehen. Die Stelle ist verfälscht: μέγα φῶς Reiske . . . Vielleicht war die Grösse angegeben.' κατὰ μέγαθος would give the right sense, nor would it be difficult for κατά to fall out after νύκτας. Cf. above on 8. 1. [Dr. Postgate suggests, like Krüger, that a word is lost which gave the actual size.]

51. 1 τοῦ δὲ Ἐρμέω τὰ ἀγάλματα ὁρθὰ ἔχοντα (so Herwerden for ἔχειν τά: perhaps ἔχοντα τά) αἰδοῦς ποιεῦντες οὐκ ἀπ' Αἴγυπτίων μεμαθήκασι ἀλλ' ἀπὸ Πελασγῶν.

ποιεῦντες—μεμαθήκασι is an odd inversion of the natural way of putting it. On the principle illustrated above at 1. 141. 3 I propose to read here ποιεύσι . . . μεμαθήκοτες. Cf. the double version of 2. 64. 6 there cited.

86. 4 οἱ μὲν δὴ ἐκποδῶν μισθῷ ὁμολογήσαντες ἀπαλλάσσονται.

Krüger μισθον or ἐπὶ μισθῷ. Probably rather μισθόν.

93. 7 καὶ ἀναπλώντες ὅπίσω τῆς αὐτῆς ἀπέχονται (οἱ ιχθύες) ἐγχρυμπόμενοι . . . ἵνα δὴ μὴ ἀμάρτοιεν τῆς δόδοι διὰ τὸν ῥόον.

Stein, whose scholarship cannot always be trusted, detects a subtle justification for the unusual use of the optative. His meaning is not to me altogether clear, but he seems to say that ἀμάρτοιεν ascribes the purpose wholly to the fish, while ἀμάρτωσι might imply that it approved itself also to

the writer. In such fantastic grammar few scholars nowadays will believe. The optative is however a real difficulty. As far as I can see at present, the only explanation possible is that which applies to several well known similar anomalies. The author is thinking, not of the present tense actually preceding, but of a past tense which in his mind it involves. He is thinking of *δαμονίγ τις ὄρμη*, which instigates the fish to act thus. Nature or heaven made the fish in the beginning with this impulse. Cf. in 3. 108. 2 ἡ τοῦ θείου προνοίᾳ as to hares. The parallels referred to are such as Ar. *Frogs* 25 : Dem. 22. 11. In 1. 110. 4 κελεύει . . . ὅκους ἀν τάχατα διαφθαρεῖ the present κελεύει really refers to past time. ἐκέλευσε follows.

102. 4 δεινῶς γλιχομένοισι περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίης.

To get over the difficulty of *περί*, may we not deem it probable that an infinitive (*e.g.* *ἀμύνεσθαι*) has been lost? Cf. on 32. 6 above. In 134. 4 again the easiest explanation would be that a verb governed by *ἐτείτε* is missing.

111. 2 τοῦ ποταμοῦ κατελθόντος μέγυστα δὴ τότε.

Surely *μεγίστου*. The terminations are easily exchanged.

116. 1 Ἐλένης μὲν ταύτην ἄπειν κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps *τουαύτην*. Cf. above on 1. 116. 3. This does not seem one of the cases in which the substantive can be taken as appositional and explanatory. In 135. 4 and the parallel 4. 166. 2 should the same change be made? See Stein on the former of the two.

125. 2. In the building of the great pyramid, when a stone had been raised on to the first step, *ἐς ἐτέρην μηχανὴν ἐτίθετο ἐστεῶν* ἐπὶ τοῦ πρώτου στοίχου, ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δεύτερον εἰλκετο στοίχον ἐπ' ἀλλῆς μηχανῆς.

Anyone might think the ἀλλῆ μηχανῆ had not been mentioned before, but it is evidently identical with the *ἐτέρη μηχανὴ* of the preceding clause. Is not *ἐπ'* ἀλλῆς μηχανῆς an insertion?

133. 3 συνταχύνειν αὐτῷ τὸν βίον.

*συνταχύνειν?* But the present and aorist are sometimes used of the future in oracular declarations, as though expressing fate rather than foresight.

135. 2 μεγάλα ἐκτήσατο χρήματα, ὡς ἀν εἶναι Ποδῶπιν.

See this *Review* 6. 341 for my suggestion of ὡς δὴ εἶναι, ὡς δὴ being a common enough combination. But I do not now think the accusative can stand, though Cobet was satisfied with it. If *she* is the subject of εἶναι, we should need the nominative. Read Ποδῶπιος with Valckenaeer and make the money the subject. 8. 4 of this book, οὐκέτι πολλὸν χωρίον, ὡς εἶναι Αἰγύπτιον, will be just parallel.

146. 2 ἔφη ἄν τις καὶ τούτους ἄλλους γενομένους ἄνδρας ἔχειν τὰ ἔκεινων ὄνόματα τῶν προγεγονότων θεῶν.

ἄλλους has been found a difficulty. I conjecture αὐτούς, a word elsewhere confused with ἄλλος. 'These themselves too,' like Heracles.

156. 1 οὐτος μάν ννον ὁ νηὸς τῶν φανερῶν μοι τῶν περὶ τοῦτο τὸ ιρόν ἔστι θωμαστότατον τῶν δὲ δευτέρων νῆσος κ.τ.λ.

Read τοῦ δὲ δευτέρου. There would not be a number of things that came second. Gomperz has suggested τῶν δὲ δευτέρου, which I do not quite understand.

172. 2 μετὰ δὲ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀμαστος οὐκ ἀγνομοσύνη προσηγάγετο.

οὐκ ἀγ. is little better than nonsense, and οὐκ ἀγνομοσύνη, for which there is the authority of the Aldine, is but unsatisfactory. Why should H. carefully distinguish here σοφίᾳ and ἀγνομοσύνη? Keeping ἀγνομοσύνη, I cannot but think οὐκ a mistake for καὶ. Perhaps the εν had something to do with it.

178. 1 τοῖσι δὲ μὴ βούλομένοισι αἰτῶν οἰκέειν (ἐνοικέειν R) αὐτοῦ δὲ ναντιλλομένοισι έδωκε χωρους κ.τ.λ.

Certainly αἰτῶν cannot go with a verb of motion. Hence Herwerden conjectures and prints αἰτότε, but that word is unemphatic and by no means strong enough for the position. αἰτοῦ must go with οἰκέειν and is quite naturally contrasted with the verb of motion: before δὲ some other word, *e.g.* αἰτί or πολλάκις has been lost (οἰκέειν αἰτοῦ, πολλάκις δέ).

### BOOK III.

10. 4 After saying that Thebes had never known rain before or since, he adds ἀλλὰ καὶ τότε ὑσθησαν αἱ Θῆβαι ψακάδι. The editors do not tell us the meaning of καὶ τότε, words which can hardly be divided. Perhaps τότε is out of its place. We might for instance read τότε καὶ ὑσθησαν. At the end of 23 the καὶ before τὸ δεσμωτήριον should probably be omitted altogether.

23. 1 In *ἔτεα μὲν . . . ἀπικνέεσθαι*, Krüger held that something like *ἔφη* should be inserted. Rather perhaps *φάναι*, corresponding to the infinitives which follow.

25. 2 ὡς ἡκουε τῶν Ἰχθυοφάγων.

Is this Homeric use of *ἀκούω*, *hear of*, with a genitive found elsewhere in H.? Perhaps *περί* is lost.

30. 6 ὁ δὲ . . . ἀπέκτεινε Σμέρδιν, οἱ μὲν λέγοντις ἐπ' ἄγρην ἔξαγαγόντα, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν προαγαγόντα καταποτώσαν.

I suspect H. wrote *ἔξαγαγών*, *οἱ μὲν λέγοντις* being parenthetical as in 2. 181. 2. In the second clause *λέγοντις* steps into the government, but in the first this would be extremely awkward. *ἔξαγαγών* was then accommodated to *προαγαγόντα*.

34. 4 Are not the words *νῦν . . . νοήμονα* a question?

52. 4 ἐν αἰτοῖσι. There is nothing for *αἰτοῖσι* to refer to. Read *τούτοισι*, the mistake being not very uncommon. So in 82. 9 *αἰτῶν* should probably be *τούτων*.

ib. 7 Surely Stein and Herwerden are wrong in preferring *στεῖλας πλοίον το στεῖλας πλοίω*. Cf. for instance 8. 75. 2 *πέμπτε . . . ἀνδρα πλοίῳ* and *πλοίῳ ἀπικόμενος*: 6. 76. 3 *πλοίοισι σφέας ἥπαγε*: 4. 42. 4 and 44. 1: this book 44. 4: etc.

60. 1 μᾶλλόν <τι> ὅτι, as at the end of the chapter.

71. 7 ἡ ἵστε ἵμνυ ὅτι, ἦν ἵπερπέστη ἡ νῦν ἵμέρη, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλος φθᾶς ἐμεῦ (Sobet ἐμὲ) κατίγορος ἔσται, ἀλλά σφεα αὐτὸς ἐγὼ κατέρὼ πρὸς τὸν Μάγον.

Is not *ἵμνυ* out of its place? It could only stand where it does, if very emphatic; and that is not the case. It might perhaps follow either *ὅτι* or *ἥν*, unless indeed it is a mere dittograph of the *ἵμνυ* in the line preceding: *σφέα* hardly harmonises with it.

110. 2 θρία πτερωτὰ . . . ἐς ἀλκήν ἀλκιμα.

Stein seems strangely content with the tautology of *ἀλκήν* and *ἀλκιμα*. Herwerden remarks *quid lateat non exruto*. May it not be *δόκιμα*? *ἀ*, *δ*, and *λ* are constantly confused. In 7. 129. 3 we hear of rivers, *ἵστε τῶν δοκίμων μάλιστα*, and *ib.* 162. 3 *ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἔστι τὸ ἔπειρον δοκιμώτατον*. (The question of the authenticity of these words is not material.)

116. 3 *ai δὴ ὡν ἵσχαται οἴκασι . . . τὰ*

κάλλιστα δοκέοντα ἵμνυ εἶναι καὶ σπανιώτατα ἔχειν αὖται.

αὖται at the very end of the sentence presents no analogy to the use of *οὗτος* in the middle of a sentence, resuming after a description or semi-digression, to which Stein vainly compares it. Codex R has *αὖτά*, from which Herwerden after Dietsch reads *τὰ αὖτά*, with the strange result that winged snakes would have to be included among the *κάλλιστα*, as they certainly are among the *σπανιώτατα*. Perhaps *ai αὖται* might do, that really equalling *καὶ τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ τὰ σπανιώτατα*.

119. 3 ἔλαβε αὐτὸν τε κ.τ.λ.

*συνέλαβε* is the usual word, and *συλλαβών* is used three lines later.

128. 4 Bagaeus took some *βιβλία* with him καὶ Ὁρούτεω ἐς ὅψιν ἐλθὼν τῶν βιβλίων ἐν ἔκστον πειραρέμενος ἐδίδον τῷ γραμματιστῇ.

It is explained that *πειραρέμενος*, which ought to refer to the cover, is here applied to the thing covered, *taking off* for *uncovering*. Perhaps H. wrote *προαιρέμενος* *taking out*, just as in 78. 2 we have *τὰ τόξα κατελόμενος*, *taking down*. Cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 419 *προαιρούσας*, the active participle, in this sense.

134. 7 λέγει Ἀτοσσα τὰδε ὥρα νῦν, ἐπὶ Σκύθας μὲν τὴν πρώτην ἴεται ἔασον . . . σὺ δὲ κ.τ.λ.

This use of *ὥρα*, merely introducing another imperative, without there being anything for anyone to 'see', is probably unique, and Stein regards it as doubtful. What if we turned it by a slight change into *δρᾶ* and joined *τὰδε* with it, reading *δρᾶ νῦν τὰδε* or *τὰδε νῦν δρᾶ*, if it is thought that *τὰδε δρᾶ νῦν* could hardly be right? For the simple *Ἀτοσσα λέγει* cf. Chh. 71-73 of this book in several places (*λέγει πρὸς ταῦτα Δαρεῖος*, and so on).

136. 3 ἐνθαῦτα δὲ ἐκ ῥηστώνης τῆς Δημοκύδεος Ἀριστοφιλίδης . . . τὰ πηδάλια παρέλυσε τῶν Μηδικέων νεών.

The uncertainty of the text is well known. *ῥηστώνης* Wesseling e cod. Cantabr.: *κρητώνης* R, *κρητώνης* ceteri' says Stein in his critical edition, and *ῥηστώνης* is explained to mean good will, kindness to Democedes. Unfortunately there is no evidence that *ῥ.* ever has any such meaning. The three other passages quoted for it by Liddell and Scott exhibit in

reality nothing but the ordinary sense. *χρησιμοτέρης* has been conjectured and read, but is of course not very likely. I am disposed to suggest *ἐκ πίστοντος τὴν Δημοκρίτεος, to relieve D.* *ἐκ* and *ἐσ* or *εἰς* are very easily mistaken for one another.

137. 6 ἵνα φαγῇ πρὸς Δαρείον ἐών καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ δόκιμος.

I do not know how the editors can have persuaded themselves that this means *appear to Darius, be seen by Darius*. That would require either *Δαρείον* with *φαγῇ* or with *πρὸς Δαρείον* some other verb. The only sense the text can well bear is *appear, be made out, on D.'s part*, that is, by *D.*, and this is of course quite unsuit-

able. A suggestion which seems obvious, but which does not appear to have been made, is *πρὸς Δαρείον*, with which *φαγῇ* might mean *be made out, represented to D.*, much as Clytemnestra says *Agam.* 593 λόγος τοιούτοις πλαγκτὸς οὐσ' ἐφανόμην, only with no suggestion of falsity. *φαγῇ* would roughly = *ἀπαγγελθῆ*.

139. 5 ταύτην πωλέω μὲν οὐδενὸς χρήματος, διδῷμι δὲ ἄλλως.

ἄλλως not *gratis*, a sense for which there is no evidence, but *only, just*, a slight extension of its common idiomatic meaning, *only* i.e. *no more than*. In English *just* has the same capability of meaning.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

### PLATONICA III.

THE chief aim of these papers has been to eliminate the Renaissance MSS. particularly *Ξqv*, from the *recensio* of the *Republic*. As the nature of the problem changes completely, so far as *Ξ* is concerned, shortly after the beginning of Book III, it will be well to summarise the results of our inquiry so far.

#### I.

It is a remarkable fact that Mr. Adam does not quote *Ξ* once for a reading which he adopts in Book II. In Book I he quotes it in support of his own text twelve times; but in one of these cases the reading is also that of *A* (330e ἡδίκηκεν), while in three of them it is that of the contemporary diorthotes (duly cited by Mr. Adam as *A<sup>2</sup>*), and the citation of *Ξ* is quite superfluous.<sup>1</sup> We are left, then, with eight *Ξ* readings, of which, however, four are in *Vind. F.*<sup>2</sup> Of the remaining four, I believe three to be wrong,

<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt that *A<sup>2</sup>* was contemporary; for he added the accents and breathings in the same ink as he made his interlinear corrections, and the accents are as a rule adapted to the corrections rather than to the original text. Indeed it seems most probable that *A* and *A<sup>2</sup>* are one and the same person. I have examined *A* and the Paris MS. of Maximus Tyrius, written by the same scribe, side by side, and they both present the same phenomenon. See T. W. Allen in *Journal of Philology* xxi. pp. 48 ff. The three readings referred to are 327c δὲ λείπεται, 333e οὐκ ἀν οὐν, 352b δὴ καὶ οὐς. The last is also in *F*.

<sup>2</sup> These are 339d δὲ (for δι), 346d αὐτη (for αὐτή), 347a ὁν (for φ), 352d δὲτι (for δε τι).

namely 332b δὲ (for δε γε),<sup>3</sup> 346b ξυμφέρειν,<sup>4</sup> and 353d ἐκείνου.<sup>5</sup> It is just to keep out such facile corrections that it is necessary to purge the *apparatus*. We are left with 342b, αὐτή for αὐτη, which can hardly be said to count. Even if the three readings which I object to are right, this is a small contribution for *Ξ* to make to the text of two whole books.

Now the reason why *Ξ* is so unfruitful up to this point is that it generally agrees with *A*; it is only after III 389d that it begins to show a tendency to keep company with *F* rather than *A* and so becomes more useful in correcting *A*.<sup>6</sup> That is because it is copied from *Ven. T* so far as the old part of that MS. goes, viz. to III 389d σωφρούντης δρα οὐ δείχεται. After that, it is based upon another MS., which can also be identified.

The external evidence that Rhosus, the scribe of *Ξ*, had *T* in his possession is complete. As Bekker saw, the Timaeus Locus, the epitome of Plutarch περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαιῷ

<sup>3</sup> I miss the γε here very much. Polemarchos is eager and insistent, 'and what is owing from an enemy to an enemy,' etc. On δε γε see the excellent note of Forman, *Selections from Plato*, p. 428.

<sup>4</sup> C.R. xviii. 204. Note that the reading ξυμφέρειν is ascribed to *Ξ<sup>2</sup>*, that is, in all probability, Cardinal Bessarion himself. It is also in *F*.

<sup>5</sup> No doubt it is illogical for ἐκείνους to take the gender of ψυχῆ instead of ἥσθ' ὅτῳ, but see Campbell, *Essay on Syntax*, § 56. These 'assimilations' always fall an easy prey to the corrector.

<sup>6</sup> The change begins to show itself at once. In 389e *Ξ* has the *F* reading παρ 'Ομήρῳ instead of 'Ομήρῳ with ADM.

*ψυχογονίας* and the index of Thrasyllus at the beginning of T are in the hand of Rhosus himself, and the evidence that Rhosus made use of T, not only in the *Republic* but elsewhere, is also complete. As, however, the facts about T are still sometimes misapprehended, and as I can add something to what has already been said about them, I must sum them up briefly.

Ven. T is not, as used to be thought, a twelfth century MS. How much older it may be, I cannot say; but, as Schanz points out, it is practically as well written as Par. A itself.<sup>1</sup> Schanz has shown that, in tetralogies i-vii, it is the source of what he calls the 'second family,' which he had already recognised as quite independent of the Clarkianus. He was inclined to believe, however, at one time that, in the *Republic*, it was copied from A, though he expressed some doubts upon the point. Later he announced that a comparison of the scholia in the two MSS. had strengthened these doubts, and he promised a separate discussion of the point.<sup>2</sup> I cannot find that this ever appeared; but I can state, from my own examination of the MS., what is the essential point. The long scholium on 337a μάλα στρατόνιον appears at full length in T, while A has in it a much abbreviated form. It follows that T is independent of A as well as of B, though it is very closely related to A indeed. The fact that AT have reproduced their common archetype in such a way as to present a practically identical text, speaks highly for both, and raises the value of T immensely. More than ever we can regard it as taking the place of the lost first volume of A.

Turning now to Mon. *q*, we find that, in these books, Mr. Adam quotes it ten times for a reading which he adopts (apart from places where he quotes A<sup>2</sup> or Ξ). Four of these readings are in F,<sup>3</sup> and two I believe to be wrong.<sup>4</sup> There remain these four:

337a, b ἀποκρινοῖ, ἀποκρινότο (for ἀποκρίνοι, ἀποκρίνοτο).

342a ἐκποριόντς (for ἐκποριζόντς).

370a ῥάον (for ῥάδιον).

370e ἵη (for εἰη).

All these I believe to be right, though

<sup>1</sup> Schanz, *Rhein. Mus.* xxxiii. 305.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Platocodex*, p. 78, n. 1 and *Rhein. Mus.* xxxiii. 305.

<sup>3</sup> These are 333d δέη, 351a έφην ('et fortasse A'), 363d ἀποτίνεσι (*C.R.* xix. 100), and 375b ἀλλοῖς. (Vind. E is apparently a misprint for Vind. F in Schneider here.)

<sup>4</sup> These are 364c βλάψειν (*C.R.* xix. 100), and 376a οἰδέν δῆ.

Schneider rejects the first two; but I observe that they are all corrections of the same type, the type of which Cobet made hundreds, and every scholar makes some. I suspect that they are due to no less a person than Gemistos Plethon; but there is in any case abundant evidence to show that the text of *q* was the work of an excellent scholar who did not scruple to re-write what he did not understand. That is why Mon. *q* will always have a place in the *apparatus*, the same sort of place that Ficino and Cornarius have; for it belongs to the *emendatio*, and not to the *recensio*. For anything that must be a genuine tradition independent of the II class of MSS., Mon. *q* will be searched in vain.

Besides Ξq Mr. Adam quotes Ang. *v* six times in *Republic* I. II. for readings which he adopts, but it is unnecessary to discuss these. They are, of course, one and all in F.

## II.

We come now to the question of the original of Ξ from 389d onwards. A cursory inspection shows that it now tends to go with F against A, both when it is wrong and when it is right. The received view is that it is derived from Flor. c, and I have no doubt at all that this is correct.<sup>5</sup> Further, it is generally admitted that Flor. c is a copy of Flor. a, and that too I believe to be the case.<sup>6</sup> But when I come to the further statement made by Jordan (*Hermes*, xiii, 470 ff.) that, in all the dialogues which it contains, Vind. F is manifestly derived from Flor. a, I find myself face to face with a difficulty. I have been trying to show that F is derived from an early uncial codex, and I have been able to convince Professor Diels and Professor Immisch that this is so;<sup>7</sup> but here we have a statement by a recognised authority on the subject that Vind. F is derived from another extant

<sup>5</sup> See Schanz, *Platocodex*, pp. 81, 94, 97 ff. Of course we must remember that Ξ is no mere transcript (see O. Immisch, *Philol. Studien* ii. p. 14); but at the same time there can be no doubt that some one MS. regularly formed its ground-text. This comes out particularly well in the *Critias* where Ξ is really a transcript of c. Bessarion does not appear to have worked over it.

<sup>6</sup> See Schanz, *Hermes* x. 173 ff., Hiller, *Hermes* x. 325 *sqq.* (the derivation of c from a holds for Theon of Smyrna and Albinus contained in both), Schanz, *Platocodex*, p. 60.

<sup>7</sup> I am surprised, however, that Immisch thinks the confusion of ἐν ὅ and ἐνι, to which I called attention in *C.R.* xvi. 99, unconvincing. Surely it is only in uncials that ΕΠΙ and ΕΗΙ are likely to be taken for each other.

fourteenth century MS. I have already stated (*C.R.* xvii. 12) that I do not accept Jordan's view, but I have not yet had an opportunity of discussing it. That must be done now. I prefer, however, not to marshal arguments from Schneider's edition of the *Republic*; when once the point has been made clear, anyone can do that for himself. I prefer to give something new. There is no published collation of F in the *Critias*, but I have in my possession a very minute one made by Professor Král. A comparison of this with Bekker's collation of Flor. a (z) in that dialogue will be more interesting and will prove all that is necessary.

From Bekker's *apparatus* it is at once evident that all the MSS. other than A collated by him in the *Critias* form a class by themselves and go back to a common archetype. Within this class two manu-

scripts, Ven. 189 (Σ=Schanz's S) and Vat. 228 (σ) distinguish themselves, as Schanz has observed, by agreeing more often with A than the others.<sup>1</sup> I believe, however, that this is merely due to their common archetype having been corrected from a MS. of another family, though this probability may be disregarded for our present purpose.<sup>2</sup> The remaining MSS. Σv z (=Flor. a) b (=Flor. x) c (=Flor. e) ti all go together, and with them, as we should expect from the presence of Flor. x Ang. v. goes F.

Now it is certain that F is more closely akin to Flor. a (z) than any other of these MSS. except xv, but it is also certain that it is not derived from it. On the contrary, it has a far better text, and is free from many of the corruptions of Flor. a, as the following examples will show sufficiently.

	PAR. A	VIND. F	FLOR. a
Critias 107c	χαλεπότητος	χαλεπότητος	λεπτότητος (c Σ vulg.)
	μεμήσθαι	μεμιεσθαι <sup>3</sup>	μεν μιμείσθαι (c Σ vulg.)
108d	τίς τι	τις είλ	τισι (c Σ vulg.)
109d	οἴδ' θτι	οἴδ' θτι	οἰσθ' θτι (c Σ vulg.)
	σέσωται	σέσωται <sup>4</sup>	σέσωται (c Σ vulg.)
	δρειν	ο * * * πίων <sup>5</sup>	ράων (c Σ)
111d	γῆι	γῆι	τῆι (c : καὶ Σ vulg.)
112a	γενομένου	γενομένου	οιν. (om. c Σ vulg.)
	τῆις πυκῆς	τῆις πυκῆς	πυκώς (c Σ)
112c	καταγράωτες	καταγράωτες	κατηγρούοντες (c Σ)
113c	λαχῶν	λαχῶν	λαλῶν (c Σ)
114b	εὐάιμονα	εὐάιμονα	εὐδάίμονα (c Σ vulg.)
114e	τὰ περὶ τὰ	περὶ τὰ	περιττὰ (c Σ vulg.)
116e	δελφίνων	δελφίνων	δελφικῶν (c Σ vulg.)

I have kept to the last the two amusing corruptions of c Σ in the *Critias* discussed by Schanz (*Platocodex*, p. 97), as I can supplement what he says by the readings of F. They are as follows :

116c ἔφιτσαν καὶ A (Σσ) : ἔφιτσαν καὶ F : ἔφιταν καὶ a : ἔφιτ καὶ c : ἔφι . . . . . Σ : ἔφικτὸν Ald. (!).

<sup>1</sup> *Platocodex*, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> Schanz had seen (*Platonic opera* IX. p. x) that FS were derived from a common archetype in the *Hippias Minor*, *Io*, and *Menexenus*, and I pointed out (*Platonic opera* III. praeft.) that in S the Homeric citations had been adapted to the ordinary text of Homer, a sure sign of editing. In the *Timaeus*, S represents an entirely different tradition, but it continues to go very closely with F. It is not, however, derived from it, as Schanz supposed (*Platocodex*, p. 105), but from a corrected copy of the same archetype. We have, in fact, two traditions of this archetype, but only that represented by F is free from corrections taken from other families of MSS.

<sup>3</sup> In this case A is wrong and F very nearly right. The true reading, μεμήσθαι, is found in Σσ, and the misspelling in F represents an earlier stage of the corruption in a.

121a διὰ πλοῦτον ἀκράτορες αὐτῶν ὅτες ἐσφάλλοντο A : διὰ πλοῦτον ἐσφάλλοντο ἀκράτορες αὐτῶν ὅτες Σσ : διπλοῦ τοῦ ἀκρατος αὐτῶν ὅτες ἐσφάλλοντο F : διπλοῦ τοῦ ἀκρατος δὲ αὐτῶν ὅτες ἐσφάλλοντο a : διπλοῦ τοῦ ἀκράτον δὲ αὐτῶν ὅτες ἐσφάλλοντο c Σ : οἴδι ὅτι τοῦ ἀκράτον ἀμβλυώττοντες ἐσφάλλοντο Ald. (!!).

<sup>4</sup> This is specially instructive ; for Cobet (*Mnem.* 1875, p. 196) cites the preservation of σέσωται as proof of the unique excellency of Par. A. 'Quis codex, omnium quos habemus,' he says, 'tam bonus testis est ut servet σέσωται et διασέσωται ? Nullum unquam vidi.' The scribe of A was evidently struck by the form ; for he repeats it in the margin. The Metropolitan Constantine has of course 'corrected' it to σέσωται in his ugly hand. Just below in 110a διασέσωται appears in F as διασέσωται, which shows that we have to do with tradition and not grammatical theory in the first passage.

<sup>5</sup> This is an instructive example in another way. In F the second hand (f) has made πίων into πείων, and in Flor. x we have accordingly ο \* \* \* πείων. Ang. v. has preferred to write οἴπων. The ράων of 'corr. Σ,' which also occurs in acē looks like an attempt to Atticize πείων !

## III.

Failure to understand these things has led to a reading no less arbitrary and absurd than ἐφικτόν and οὐδὲ ἵπτοι τοῦ ἀκράτον ἀμβλυνόττρον (which I take to be the handiwork of Musurus<sup>1</sup>) still standing in the texts of Stallbaum, the Zürich editors, and Hermann.

Critias is explaining how it was that prehistoric Athens was able to conform to the precepts of the Republic by keeping τὸ μάχιμον as a class apart. It was because the soil was so fertile, before the process of denudation set in, that fewer hands were required to till it, and a larger number of the population were free to devote themselves to warlike pursuits. In Par. A the passage runs quite distinctly thus:

ἀρετὴ δὲ πᾶσαν γῆν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐνθάδε ὑπερβάλλεσθαι διὸ καὶ δυνατὴν ἔναι τότε τρέφειν τὴν χώραν στρατόπεδον πολὺ τῶν περὶ γῆν ἀργὸν ἥργον (110e).

As Cobet puts it (*Mnem.* 1875, p. 202) τῶν περὶ γῆν ἀργὸν ἥργων is 'exquisitus dictum pro τῆς γεωργίας σχολῆν ἀγον vel οὐκ ἴργαζόμενον τὴν γῆν,' which is exactly the sense required.

Unfortunately, however, the vulgate text came from Ξ and not from A, and there was already a corruption in the common archetype of F and Flor. a, which grew like the others till it called for desperate remedies. The history of the passage is as follows:—

Σα τῶν περὶ τὴν γῆν ἀργὸν ἥργων  
Fx v τῶν τὸν περὶ τὴν γ' ἄρ ὅν ἥργων  
Flor. a τῶν τὸ περὶ τὴν γ' ἄρ ὅν ἥργων

<sup>1</sup> It is true they occur in one MS. (i.); but, according to Schanz, that is copied from the *Aldine*. I suggest as a question for further inquiry whether it may not be the press copy from which the *Aldine* was printed.

Flor. c τὸ τῶν περὶ τὴν γ' ἄρ ὅν ἥργων  
Ξ τὸ τῶν περὶ ante lacunam  
Ald. τὸ τῶν περιοίκων.

Now Bekker, with his usual acuteness, saw that τὸ τῶν περιοίκων was nonsense. It is absurd to identify the Guardians with περιοίκοι of any sort, especially as they live on the Akropolis. So Bekker printed the reading of Ξ, which is practically right. Unfortunately he said, by some oversight, that περιοίκων was the reading of A. This was enough to blind subsequent editors to the absurdity of the text, and Stallbaum, who had never seen A, says 'in A liquido scriptum περιοίκων.' He even observes: 'Quod Bekkerus dedit . . . id fateor me non intelligere,' but he does not tell us what he thought περιοίκων meant. Still, A was not such a fetish then as it afterwards became, and Stallbaum suggested that there might be something concealed in the readings of the Flor. a group. Winkelmann thought he had discovered it, and conjectured τῶν περὶ τὴν γῆν ἔγραψαρότων περιοίκων. Such have been the fortunes of Musurus's desperate shot, and περιοίκων held its ground till Schneider tacitly restored the true reading of A in the Didot edition!

Now the moral of this is that, even if περιοίκων had been the reading of A, Ξ would have given us no help at all. Unhappily Mon. q does not contain the Critias; for, if it did, we should have had something really clever. Bekker came very near the truth by tapping the stream higher up, and that, I contend, we ought to do in cases where A breaks down just as much as in places where, like the present, it has been misrepresented.

JOHN BURNET.

ON NICOMACHEAN ETHICS VI. i. 1139<sup>a</sup> 3-6.

In the *C.R.* for February last, p. 14, my friend Mr. L. H. G. Greenwood maintains that *N.E.* vi. i. = *E.E.* v. i. 1139<sup>a</sup> 3—πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἀλέχθη δυνάμει μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς, τό τε λόγον ἔχον καὶ τὸ ἀλογον νῦν δὲ περὶ τοῦ λόγου ἔχοντος τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον διαιρετέον—affords 'a strong but hitherto unnoticed proof' that this book belongs to the Nicomachean treatise: for, 'while the Nicomachean 1st book speaks of τὸ ὄρεκτικόν as ἀλο-

γον in the first place (1102 b 13), and only afterwards allows it, and then with some reservation (οὐ κυρίως), some title to be called part of the λόγον ἔχον, the Eudemian 2nd book on the other hand refers to it from the first as λόγον ἔχον, with only a slight reservation in favour of the Nicomachean view (1219 b 28).' Now in *N.E.* vi. i. = *E.E.* v. i., Mr. Greenwood continues, 'there is no suggestion that the ὄρεκτικόν

could possibly be considered as anything but *āλογον*, which goes a little beyond even the Nicomachean passage, but is entirely inconsistent with the Eudemian.'

I am not able to accept Mr. Greenwood's account either of the statement in *N.E.* i or of the statement in *E.E.* ii.

He tells us that 'the Nicomachean 1st book speaks of *τὸ ὄρεκτικόν* as *ἄλογον* in the first place (1102 b 13), and *only afterwards* allows it, and then with some reservation (*οὐ κυρίως*), some title to be called part of the *λόγον ἔχον*.' I think that the words which I have italicized—'only afterwards'—stand in need of qualification. The sentence to which Mr. Greenwood explicitly refers, 1102 b 13, runs as follows: *ἔσκι δὲ καὶ ἀλλη τις φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς ἄλογος εἶναι, μετέχοντα μέντοι πῃ λόγου*. It is then in the very same sentence in which Aristotle for the first time speaks of the *ὄρεκτικόν* as *φύσις ἄλογος*, though no doubt in the second clause of that sentence, that he speaks of this *φύσις ἄλογος* as *μετέχοντά πῃ λόγου*, that is to say, as he presently explains, *πειθαρχῶντα τῷ λόγῳ*.

Mr. Greenwood tells us next that 'the Eudemian 2nd book refers to it from the first as *λόγον ἔχον*, with only a slight reservation in favour of the Nicomachean view (1219 b 28).' The sentence which Mr. Greenwood here cites is—*ἴτοκείσθω δύο μέρη ψυχῆς τὰ λόγου μετέχοντα, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον μετέχειν λόγου ἄμφω, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν τῷ ἐπιτάπτειν, τὸ δὲ τῷ πειθεσθαι καὶ ἀκούειν πεφικέναι εἰ δέ τι ἔστιν ἐτέρως ἄλογον, ἀφίσθω τοῦτο τὸ μόριον*. In the earlier part of this sentence, the author of the *Eudemians* distinguishes between the *λόγον ἔχον* proper and the other *λόγον μετέχον* in precisely the same way as the author of the *Nicomacheans*: and the latter part in which the author of the *Eudemians* speaks of the *ἄλογον* proper (nutrition, growth, etc.) as *ἐτέρως ἄλογον*, affords clear proof that he regards the *ὄρεκτικόν*, not only as in a qualified sense *λόγον ἔχον*, but also as, except in this qualified sense, *ἄλογον*. Moreover, in the second book, and in the *Eudemian* treatise generally, the *ὄρεκτικόν* is steadily regarded as *ἄλογον*. For example, in the immediate sequel to 1219 b 28 we have 1220 a 10 *αἱ δὲ ἡθικαὶ τοῦ ἄλογον μέν, ἀκολουθητικὸν δὲ κατὰ φύσιν τῷ λόγον ἔχοντι*, and 1221 b 27 *ἐπειδὴ δύο μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ αἱ ἀρεταὶ κατὰ ταῦτα*

διγραφηται, καὶ αἱ μὲν τοῦ λόγον ἔχοντος διανοητικαὶ, ὃν ἔργον ἀλήθεια, ἡ περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἔχει ἡ περὶ γενέσεως, αἱ δὲ τοῦ ἄλογον ἔχοντος δὲ ὄρεξιν, κτλ.: and, at the end of the treatise, Θ i. 1246 b 13, 20, 21, the *ὄρεκτικόν* is spoken of as *ἄλογον*, and not as *λόγον ἔχον*.

The fact is that, of necessity, with both authors the *ὄρεκτικόν* is primarily *ἄλογον*. The distinction between the intellectual virtues and the moral, which with both writers is all-important, rests upon the psychological distinction between the *ὄρεκτικόν* and the *λόγον ἔχον*. With both authors, it is only in a special sense of the term *λόγον ἔχον* that the *ὄρεκτικόν* is called by that name: and the recognition of this fact is a declaration that 'primarily' the *ὄρεκτικόν* is *ἄλογον*.

It is easy to see why the special sense of the term *λόγον ἔχον* is taken into account. Plato, in the *Phaedrus* and in the *republic*, using the word *ψυχή* in a narrow sense, had described what Aristotle calls *ὄρεκτικόν* as *ἄλογον*. Hence Aristotle, when he includes under *ψυχή*, besides *ὄρεκτικόν*, faculties, such as *φυτικόν* or *θρητικόν*, which are neither rational nor obedient to reason, of necessity distinguishes between the purely irrational element and the element which, not being rational, is nevertheless obedient to reason. Accordingly, it is at the beginning of the psychological statement that the *ὄρεκτικόν* is by both authors admitted to be in a qualified sense *λόγον ἔχον*. When once the distinction between the purely irrational part and the part which is obedient to reason has been established, we hear no more in either treatise about the qualified rationality of the *ὄρεκτικόν*. Henceforward, both in the undoubted *Nicomacheans* and in the undoubtedly *Eudemians*, the *ὄρεκτικόν* is always *ἄλογον*, in opposition to the true *λόγον ἔχον*. Consequently, when in *N.E.* vi. i. = *E.E.* v. i. the *ὄρεκτικόν* is described as *ἄλογον*, the description is in perfect accord with the doctrine of both treatises. So I do not see that Mr. Greenwood's line of inquiry can do anything for the settlement of the controversy about the three books which are common to the two treatises. I am sure that Mr. Greenwood is too good a Socrate to resent this frank expression of opinion.

HENRY JACKSON.

June 2, 1905.

## AD MARCUM ANTONINUM.

A, ιζ (p. 11, 20 Stich). Πάντα γάρ ταῦτα θῶν βοηθῶν καὶ τύχης δέῖται.

Verba 'θεῶν β. κ. τ. δέῖται' versus partem constituere appetat, nec inepte sic, postquam ultimo hoc capite quaecumque vitaes suae commoda deorum benignitati accepta refert enumeravit Antoninus, liber primus commentatorariorum concluditur.

Γ, δ' (p. 23, 13). 'Ο γάρ τοι ἀνὴρ διούτος—ιερεύς τίς ἔστι καὶ ὑπουργὸς θεῶν, χρώμενος καὶ τῷ ἔνδον ἰδρυμένῳ αὐτῷ—

Corrigi: χρώμενος κῷ i.e. κυρίῳ, cf. p. 59, 13 Τὸ δημονικὸν καὶ κυριεῦν τῆς ψυχῆς σου μέρος, p. 30, 16 Τὸ ἔνδον κυριεῦν.

Δ, κ' (p. 36, 15). Πᾶν τὸ καὶ ὀπωσοῦν καλὸν ἔξ ἑαυτοῦ καλὸν ἔστι —. Τοῦτο φῆμι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κοινότερον καλῶν λεγομένων οἷον ἐπὶ τῶν ὑλικῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνικῶν κατασκευασμάτων τὸ γε δῆ ὄντως καλὸν τίνος (τίνος D) χρείαν ἔχει; οὐ μᾶλλον, η νόμος, οὐ μᾶλλον, η ἀλήθεια, οὐ μᾶλλον, η εὐνοία, η αἰδώς. Τί γάρ τοιτῶν διὰ τὸ ἐπανεῖσθαι καλὸν (κάλλιον Richards<sup>1</sup>) ἔστιν, η ψεγόμενον φθείρεται; σμαράγδιον γάρ ἑαυτὸν χέριον γίνεται, εὖν τὸ ἐπανεῖσθαι; τί δὲ χρυσός, ἐλέφας, πορφύρα, μαχαίριον, ἀνθύλιον, δενδρόφυτον;

Tenebrae quibus huius capitinis sententia obvoluta est facile, si quid video, removere buntur, si verba τὸ γε δῆ (Codd. AD, vulgo τὸ δὲ δῆ) corixeris et mutata, interpungendi ratione ita scriperis: Τοῦτο φῆμι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κοινότερον καλῶν λεγομένων, οἷον ἐπὶ τῶν ὑλικῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνικῶν κατασκευασμάτων. (τὸ γὰρ δῆ ὄντως καλὸν τίνος χρείαν ἔχει; οὐ μᾶλλον η νόμος, οὐ μᾶλλον, η ἀλήθεια, οὐ μᾶλλον η εὐνοία, η αἰδώς): τι τοιτῶν διὰ τὸ ἐπανεῖσθαι κάλλιον ἔστιν, η ψεγόμενον φθείρεται; σμαράγδιον γάρ ε.ο.σ.

Per ταῦτα (τί γάρ τοιτῶν διὰ τὸ ἐπ. κάλλιον ἔστι) non νόμος, ἀλήθεια, εὐνοία, αἰδώς significantur sed priora illa, τὰ ὑλικά scilicet et τὰ τεχνικὰ κατασκευάσματα, quod ex iis quae sequuntur satis dilucide appetat, ubi tam τῶν ὑλικῶν exempla promuntur (σμαράγδιον, χρυσός, ἐλέφας similia) quam τῶν τεχνικῶν κατασκευασμάτων, qualia sunt λύρα, μαχαίριον 'λύρα' enim, quod in Codd. ADC legitur, omnino adservandum erat.

Δ, λη' (p. 42, 16). Τὰ δημονικὰ αὐτῶν διάβλεπε, <ἰδέ> καὶ τοὺς φρονίμους, οἵα μὲν φεύγουσιν, οἵα δὲ διώκουσιν.

Inserui ἰδέ, quod a librario pro glossemate vocis διάβλεπε falso habitum, omissum est.

Ε, κγ' (p. 58, 22). 'Η τε γάρ οὐσία οἰον ποταμὸς ἔν διηγεκτεί βόύτει καὶ αἱ ἐνέργειαι ἐν συνεχέσι μεταβολαῖς, καὶ τὰ αἴτια ἐν μηρίαις τροπαῖς καὶ σχεδὸν οὐδὲν ἔστως καὶ τὸ πάρεγγυς τὸ δὲ ἀπειρον τοῦ τε παρωχηκότος καὶ μέλλοντος ἀχανές, φ πάντα ἐναφανίζεται.

Viro clarissimo Hoffmann<sup>2</sup> καὶ σχεδὸν οὐδὲ ἐνεστώς scribenti de loci corruptione facilius concedo quam de emendandi ratione; nam primum quidem ἐνεστώς auctori nostro inusitatum est nisi addito articulo, ita ut substantivi nominis vice fungatur significetque τὸ ἐνεστώς 'tempus instans', cf. p. 73, 15 τὸ ἐνεστώς τοῦ χρόνου et p. 86, 14 quem locum ipse Hoffmann citat: Περίγραψον τὸ ἐνεστώς τοῦ χρόνου: tum, si qui vel concedat ἐνεστώς idem esse quod ἔστως (stans), quis sibi persuadebit Antoninum ita locutum esse 'fere ne stare quidem tempus quod iuxta sit,' cum imprimis et ante omnia hoc dicendum fuerit 'fere ne praesens quidem tempus stare'! Id prius si dixisset, tum postea, si ita libuisse, potuisset adicere 'neque quod iuxta.'

Cum tamen ille significatus qui est in τῷ ἐνεστῶτι vel maxime hoc loco postuletur cumque in verbis turbatis praedicatum aliquod desideretur cui opponatur sequentis enuntiati praedicatum ἀχανές (ἔστι), in hunc modum verba tradita reformaverim:

καὶ σχεδὸν οὐδὲν <τὸ ἐν>ἔστως καὶ τὸ πάρεγγυς, τὸ δὲ ἀπειρον ε.ο.σ.=ac fere nihil est id quod instat et quod iuxta est, infinitum vero praeteriti et futuri vastum quasi chaos est.

Γ, ια' (p. 65, 1). 'Οταν ἀναγκασθῆς ὑπὸ τῶν περιεστηκότων οἰονεὶ διαταραχθῆναι.

Per οἰοεὶ et similia verbi alicuius novitas quodam modo excusari vel audacior metaphora mitigari solet: in oratione communi illa locum non habent. Corrigi διασπαραχθῆναι cf. p. 131, 19 ἐπί τοιτῶν σπαράσσοσθαι. Contra in Epicteti Enchiridio c. 5 pro vera lectione παραστώμεθα in uno codice legitur σπαραττώμεθα.

Z, κγ' (p. 85, 8). Δεινὸν δὲ οὐδὲν τὸ διαλυθῆναι τῷ κιβωτίῳ, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ συμπαγῆναι <ἀγαθόν>.

<sup>2</sup> Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique, T. xlvi. 1 (1904), p. 11 sqq.

ἀγαθὸν addidi coll. p. 101, 6 τί οὖν ἡ ἀγαθὸν τῷ σφαιρίῳ ἀναφερομένῳ, ἡ κακὸν καταφερομένῳ ἡ καὶ καταπεπτωκότι; τί δὲ ἀγαθὸν τῇ πομφόληγι συνεστῶσῃ, ἡ κακὸν διαλυθείσῃ; τί ὅμοιος δέ καὶ ἐπὶ λίγον. p. 118, 21 Τῷ ἀνάρριφθέντι λίθῳ οὐδὲν κακὸν τὸ κατενεχθῆναι, οὐδὲ ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἀνενεχθῆναι, p. 43, 13 Οὐδέν ἐστι κακὸν τούς ἐν μεταβολῇ γυνομένοις, ὡς οὐδὲ ἀγαθὸν ἐκ μεταβολῆς ὑφισταμένοις.

Z, νά' (p. 90, 9).

‘Θεόθεν δὲ πνέοντ’ οὐρον

‘Ανάγκη τλῆναι καμάτους ἀνοδόρτοις.’

His, sive ex Euripidis *Chrysippo* sumptis sicut ea quae supra (pp. 89–90) citata sunt, sive aliunde, tamen metrum suum restituatur:

‘Θεόθεν δὲ πνέοντ’ οὐρον ἀνάγκη  
Τλῆναι καμάτους ἀνοδόρτοις.’

Z, νή' (p. 92, 6). καὶ μέμνησο \*ἀμφοτέρων, ὅτι καὶ διάφορον ἐφ' οὐ η̄ πρᾶξις.

Recte fecit editor quod Gatakeri coniecurat ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων non recepit; haec enim verba in prioribus non habent quo respiciant. Immo in sequentibus lacuna statuenda est, quae si in hunc fere modum expletur, omnia recte procedunt:

καὶ μέμνησο ἀμφοτέρων, ὅτι <καὶ μεθ' ὑπεξαιρέσεως ὥρμας> καὶ διάφορον ἐφ' οὐ η̄ πρᾶξις. Cf. p. 30, 19 ἀλλὰ ὅμη μὲν πρὸς τὰ <προ-> γηγούμενα μεθ' ὑπεξαιρέσεως τὸ δὲ ἀντειπαγόμενον ὑλην ἑαυτῷ ποιεῖ, ubi haec ultima = quae in hoc de quo agimus capite p. 92, 4 καὶ ὑλη σοι ἔσται. Cf. etiam p. 78, 9 καὶ μέμνησο, ὅτι μεθ' ὑπεξαιρέσεως ὥρμας et E, κ' p. 57, 21 sqq.

H, α' (p. 96, 18). ἀρκέσθητι δέ, εἰ καν τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου, ὃσον δήποτε ἡ σὴ φύσις θέλει, βιώσῃ. Κατανόησον οὖν, τί θέλει—

Verba ὅσον δήποτε cum antecedentibus τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου iungenda esse, in proposito est; quae sequuntur (ἡ σὴ φύσις θέλει) ut significant quod debent significare ‘quomodo tuta natura vult’ sic refingo:

ἡ (vel ὡς, ut coniecit Casaubonus filius,) ἡ φύσις σοι θέλει.

Tam ἡ σὴ φύσις quam ἡ φύσις σον Antonini stilo convenit; cf. ex. gr. p. 148, 6.—ἡ = ‘sicut’ invenio p. 108, 8 (ex Gatakeri coni. pro ἡ). σοι restitui ex auctoritate Codicis A, qui οὐ θέλει exhibet.

H, γ' (p. 97, 12). Ἀλέξανδρος [δὲ] καὶ Γάιος καὶ Πορτήτος, τί πρὸς Διογένη καὶ Ἡράκλετον καὶ Σωκράτην; Οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἶδον τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὰς αἰτίας καὶ τὰς ὑγεμονικὰ ἦν αἰτῶν ταῦτα ἐκεῖ δὲ ὅσων πρόνοια καὶ δουλεία πόσων!

παράνοια Casaubonus filius, ἄγνοια Hoffmann, περίνοια Richards coniecerunt. Αντίτοιο乎? Cf. p. 133, 20 Τίς ὑπονοίας χρεία, παρὸν σκοπεῖν, τί δεῖ πραχθῆναι;

H, κ' (p. 101, 4). Η φύσις ἐστόχασται ἔκστοτι, οὐδέν τι ἔλασσον τῆς ἀπολήγεως, ἡ τῆς ἀρχῆς τε καὶ διεξαγωγῆς, ὡς ὁ ἀναβάλλων τῆς σφαιρᾶς.

Comma post ἔκάστον δειλενδον est (= ἀπόληξις, ἀρχή, διεξαγωγὴ ἔκάστον).

H, λζ' (p. 105, 20). Οὐ καὶ τούτους πρῶτον μὲν γραίας καὶ γέροντας γενέσθαι οὐτως εἴμαρτο, εἰτα ἀποθανεῖν;

Transpono εἴτα οὕτως ἀποθανεῖν; Cf. p. 165, 1 Ποῦ γὰρ ἴδων τοὺς θεούς, ἡ πόθεν κατειληφώς, ὅτι εἰσίν, οὐτω σέβεις; Cf. Epictet. iv. 8, 40, εἰς imprimis i. 26, 3 πρῶτον οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς θεωρίας γυμνάζουσαν ημάς οἱ φιλόσοφοι ὅπου ἥπον, εἰτα οὕτως ἐπὶ τὰ χαλεπώτερα ἀγονιστι, εἰτι. 13, 29 ἀλλ' ἔδει προϋποστῆναι σου τοὺς γονέας, εἰτα οὕτω γεννηθῆναι.

H, με' (p. 107, 12). Ἀρόν με καὶ βάλε, ὅποι θέλεις. Εκεῖ γάρ ἔξω τὸν ἐμὸν δαιμόνα θεων—

Corr. Κάκε.

Θ, η' (p. 116, 9).—καὶ ἐνὶ φωτὶ ὄρῳ μεν, καὶ ἐναέρᾳ ἀναπνέομεν, ὅσα δρατικὰ καὶ ἔμψυχα πάντα.

θ'. ‘Οσα κοινοῦ τυρος μετέχει, πρὸς τὸ ὄμογενον σπεύδει.

Capitii octavi ultimum verbum reddatur capitiu nōno: Πάρτα ὅσα ε.γ.θ. Cf. p. 122, 22 Πάντα, ὅσα ὄρας, τάχιστα φθαρίστεαι. Dubito an idem remedium adhibendum sit capitii 15 libri x (p. 134, 19) Ολύγονος ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπολειπόμενον τοῦτο. Ζήσον ὡς ἐν ὄρε. (Τοῦτο ζῆστον?) Cf. p. 91, 20 τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκ τοῦ περιοντος ζῆσαι κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, p. 96, 18 εἰ καν τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου ὃσον δήποτε, ἡ ἡ φύσις σου θέλει, βιώσῃ.

I, λδ' (p. 140, 10). Τῷ τεθγυμένῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀληθῶν δογμάτων ἀρκεῖ καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον καὶ ἐν μέσῳ κείμενον εἰς ἵπομησιν ἀλυπίας καὶ ἀφοβίας.

Codd: τῷ δεδηγμένῳ vel δεδογμένῳ vel τῶν δεδηγμένων. Neglectam esse Gatakeri correctionem τῷ δεδεμένῳ!

IA, η' (p. 151, 23). Δεῖ δὲ μήτε εἰρωνικὸς αὐτὸς (sc. τὸ μεταδιδόσκειν τὸν ἐπιχειροῦντά σε ὑβρίζειν) ποιεῖν, μήτε διειδοτικῶς, ἀλλὰ φιλοστρόγως καὶ δόξκτως (—τῷ Richards) τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐν σχολῇ, μηδὲ ἵνα ἄλλος παραστᾶς θαυμάσῃ. ἀλλ' ἡ τοι πρὸς μόνον, καὶ ἐὰν ἄλλοι τινὲς περιεστήκωσι. . .

Vix dubito quin omne vitium in solo *γροι* lateat neque causa sit cur lacunam suspiceris. Quamquam correctorem me non profiteor, placet tamen huiuscemodi sententia: *ἄλλα λαλητέον* vel *ἄλλ' ιτέον πρὸς μόνον*.

IA, λ<sup>ς</sup> (p. 156, 3). *Τέχνην* δὲ *ἔφη* (sc. δ *Ἐπίκτητος*) *περὶ τὸ συγκατατίθεσθαι εὑρεῖν*,—

Verae lectionis vestigia agnosco in *Cod.* Α *τέχνην* *ἔφη* δὲ et scribo: *Τέχνην, ἔφη, δεῖ* collato infra p. 156, 9 Οὐ *περὶ τοῦ τυχόντος οὐν,* *ἔφη,* *ἔστιν ὁ ἀγών,*—

IB, ια' (p. 160, 14). *Ἡλίκην ἔξονσίαν ἔχει ἀνθρώπος μητὶ ποιεῖν ἄλλο, ἢ ὅπερ μέλλει ὁ θεὸς ἐπανεῖν, καὶ δέχεσθαι πάν, ὃ ἀν νέμη ἀντῷ ὁ θεός.*

ιβ'. Τὸ ἔξης τῇ φύσει μήτε θεοῖς μεμπτέον οὐδὲν γάρ ἔκοντες ἢ ἄκοντες ἀμαρτάνονται μήτε ἀνθρώποις οὐδὲν γάρ οὐχὶ ἔκοντες. *Ὦστε οὐδὲν μεμπτέον.*

*Τὸ ἔξης τῇ φύσει* glossema esse potest ad ea quae antecedunt: *at certo certius novum caput sic incipiendum est: Μήτε θεοῖς μεμπτέον.*

A. J. KRONENBERG.

ROTTERDAM.

### ON THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS OF SENECA.

THE verses in c. 15 are surely not in their proper order; but, if we make the fourth verse the first, we shall read smoothly thus:

'Et iam cooperat fugientes semper tesseras quaerere et nihil proficere  
fusuro similis semper semperque petenti;  
nam, quotiens missurus erat resonante  
fritillo,  
utraque subducto fugiebat tessera fundo,  
cumque recollectos arderet<sup>1</sup> mittere talos,  
decepere fidem' ceterum.

After the verses we read: 'apparuit subito C. Caesar' ceterum. Surely we should expect the words 'Et iam cooperat' ceterum to be followed by '*cum*' apparuit subito C. Caesar' ceterum.

There are one or two other places in the Apocolocytosis about which I venture to offer suggestions at this time. Thus, in

c. 5 the sentence that begins 'Tum Hercules' cannot well be right in its traditional form. I offer the following attempt at correction. 'Tum Hercules primo aspectu sane perturbatus est et qui etiam omnia monstra non timerit,<sup>2</sup> ut vidit novi generis faciem, insolitum incessum, vocem . . . raucam et implacatam, putavit sibi tertium decimum labore venis<se>; se<d> diligentius intuenti visus est quasi homo.' Near the beginning of c. 12 we might well expect to find 'Et erat omnino formosissimum et impensa <cum> cura.' Again, in c. 13 the words 'primi omnium liberti Polybius . . . Pheronactus, quos Claudius omnes, nec ubi imparatus esset, praemiserat' seem to contain a flaw in the adjective *imparatus*. Can it be that an otherwise unattested *inapparitus* 'unattested' lurks here?

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

<sup>1</sup> As I would write, with Palmer, instead of the traditional 'auderet.'

<sup>2</sup> In 'qui . . . timerit' the corruption probably lies deeper.

### ON TWO PASSAGES OF THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS.

I TAKE the opportunity of the appearance of Prof. Earle's paper to add two suggestions of my own.

#### Ch. 12. In the anapaests

deflete uirum quo non aliis  
potuit citius discere causas  
una tantum parte auditæ  
saepe neutra

*neutra* scans neither as one word nor as two.  
NO. CLXX. VOL. XIX.

*nec ultra* should be read. Schneidewin has removed the same corruption from Mart. 5. 20. 11 'nunc uiuit *nec ute* sibi'; compare Lachmann's note on Lucr. 5. 839.

In Ch. 13 Prof. Earle, justly dissatisfied with *imparatus*, hazards the 'unattested *inapparitus*.' For the sense thus given to the passage the end of Ch. 3, and, especially the words 'hos' inquit 'tres—mori iubebō nec illum incomitatum dimittam,' might be compared. But I am loth to impute

*inapparitus* implying as it does a non-extant and ungrammatical past participle from the neuter verb *appareo*, even to the *lingua Claudiana*: Seneca himself could have only used it in ridicule. I believe that here we have no repetition of the gibe of Ch. 3, but a new and a far bitterer one. Comparing Suetonius *Claud.* 29, 1 'his, ut dixi, uxori-  
busque addictus non principem se sed ministrum egit, compendio cuiusque horum uel etiam studio aut libidine honores exercitus

impunitates supplicia largitus est et quidem insciens plerumque et ignarus,' and *ib.* 25 fin. 'principatum non tam suo quam uxorum libertorumque arbitrio administravit,' I propose 'necubi *imperator* esset.' Claudius is said to have despatched these freedmen to the world below in order that even there he might be no *imperator*, but a mere *liber-  
torum seruus* (Plin. *Pan.* 88) as heretofore. What could be more scathing?

J. P. POSTGATE.

#### ON THE PERVIGILIUM VENERIS.

THE ingenious paper published in the May number of the *Classical Review* might be more persuasive if the theory did not depend on the emendation *patrem* for *matrem*, which, though accepted by several scholars, is (diplomatically) unconvincing. Before stating my own view of the passage, I take the liberty of making two observations— (1) It is pertinent to the writer's argument to remember that Romulus Augustulus was not recognised as successor of Julius Nepos, except in Italy. Julius Nepos was throughout acknowledged by the Emperor Zeno as the legitimate Augustus. He seems also to have been acknowledged as such in Gaul: this is suggested by Candidus, fr. 1 (Müller, *F.H.G.* iv. 136). (2) The proposal to see in *alites* a play on the name Alethius seems extremely unlikely. In the first place, the phrases *nubunt alites* and *canoras alites* would suggest, if they suggested anything of the kind, an allusion to the bride. In the second place, there is a double difference in quantity (*Ālethius* : *ālites*). If we were in search of *annominations*, it would be more plausible to discover a play on the bride's name in the dews of verses 11–16 (*Roscia* : *roscida*).

There is no doubt that *matrem* is corrupt, but we must find a correction which will

explain the corruption. I suggest that *mater* solves the problem. Romuleas ipsa fecit cum Sabinis nuptias, Unde Ramnes et Quirites proque prole posterum Romuli mater crearet et nepotem Caesarem. That is: *unde* (sc. *Venus*) *mater crearet Ramnes et Quirites et, pro prole posterorum Romuli, et* (also) *nepotem Caesarem*. But this order of words misses the rhetorical point which is made by the juxtaposition of Romulus with Caesar in relation to their divine ancestress. Nothing was more likely than that *mater* should be altered to *matrem*, through failure to apprehend that *et* meant 'also', opposing *Caesarem* to *Romuli*, and the consequent demand for another, co-ordinated accusative.

This emendation would not necessarily exclude the Italian scholar's theory, except in regard to *Orestes*. But I have little doubt that the Caesar meant is either the original Augustus or the original Julius. No one could be less disposed than I to underrate the merits of Sidonius Apollinaris, but his extant poems do not intimate that he was, at any period of his life, susceptible of the poetical inspiration which distinguishes the *Pervigilium Veneris*, at once so fresh and so artificial.

J. B. BURY.

#### NOTES.

HERODOTUS VI. 129 AND A BUDDHIST BIRTH STORY.—Hippokleides, who 'danced off the marriage' (Hdt. vi. 129), may be a reflection of the dancing peacock in Rhys Davids' *Buddhist Birth Stories*, i.

292–3. The king of the birds had a beautiful daughter and called together all the birds that she might choose a husband. Her choice fell on the peacock. When he was told of it, he was so pleased

that he danced in the midst of the assembly and shocked the king by exposing himself. So the king said

'Pleasant is your cry, brilliant is your back,

But to such a dancer I can give no daughter, sir, of mine.'

C. M. MULVANY.

BENARES, April 20, 1905.

THE IDES OF MARCH.—On the Ides of March the *plebs* celebrated the *Annae festum geniale Perennae* (corresponding to the chief day of the Hindu *Holi*) near the banks of the Tiber (Ovid, *Fasti* iii. 523-42, 675-96). Rome was, therefore, empty of the lower classes. Is this why the nobles chose the day for the assassination of Julius Caesar?

C. M. MULVANY.

BENARES, April 20, 1905.

CICERO, *In Verr.* II. 1. § 149.—*Ut uno minus teste haberet, Habonio opus in acceptum retulit, etc.* 'To have one less witness (against him), he gave H. a quittance for the work.' Prof. Peterson (*supra* p. 160) suggests *ageret* for *haberet*, which *pax* Madvig he thinks 'is an impossible reading.' But Prof. Peterson himself quotes a parallel from the same book, § 117 *uno signo ut sit minus*, 'supposing there be one seal too few.' If *uno signo minus* can be subject of *sit*, why cannot *uno minus teste* be object of *haberet*?

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

ON JUVENAL, *Sat.* i. 144.

'Hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus.'

The difficulty of explaining the word 'intestata' is well known. It has been pointed out that the meaning required by the context is that the foolish habit of bathing shortly after a heavy meal prevented men from living to old age, and Mr. Housman (*Class. Rev.* vol. xiii. p. 434) tries to force this meaning out of 'intestata' in defiance of Latinity. By the trifling change of one letter I propose to read 'intentata,' i.e. 'intemperata senectus,' which seems to give the desired meaning 'old age untried,' that is 'old age unreached,' i.e. 'they never reached to old age, but died young.'

E. C. CORELLI.

Pembroke College, Oxford.

REVIEWS.

WYSE'S *ISAECUS*.

*The Speeches of Isaeus, with Critical and Explanatory Notes.* By WILLIAM WYSE. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1904. Pp. lxiv + 735. 18s. net.

It is a matter for congratulation to English scholarship that we have now an edition of Isaeus τετράγωνος καὶ—almost—ἄνεψ ψόγον. Mr. Wyse gives us, besides a text (pp. 1-174), reconstituted on the soundest lines of criticism, an exhaustive commentary (pp. 175-723), indices of proper names, of subjects, of certain Greek words, two pedigree tables, and a Critical Introduction.

To refer first to this, Mr. Wyse sums up (§ 1) the conclusions of modern scholars that all other MSS. of *Isaeus* except Q are derived from A. He then (§ 2) tells the story of this MS., its provenience—to Anglicize a useful French term—in the monastery on Mount Athos, its purchase by Cripps and subsequent fortune till it came to repose in the British Museum. Three more sections describe the MS., its corrections and its faults. Of the other independent witness, Q, Mr. Wyse has been able to pro-

cure photographs, and he demonstrates that, while of inferior value to A, it is nevertheless useful for checking the readings of A. A sketch (§ 7) of the MSS. of Dionysius' rhetorical work, and an exhaustive review of 'editions and subsidia' complete the Introduction.

Mr. Wyse defines the leading purpose of his edition as being 'to show by analysis of the extant speeches that ancient scholars had a juster appreciation of the orator's art than is shown by modern writers on Greek Law, for some of whom his unsupported statements appear to carry the authority of decisions of a Supreme Court.' He undoubtedly does for his author what editors of other orators too seldom attempt: he makes the reader understand that a speech for one party to a suit does not set out to give the arguments for both sides. He quotes Dionysius' words that Isaeus πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἀντιδικον διαπονηρέσται, τοὺς δὲ δικαστὰς καταστραγγεῖ, τοῖς δὲ πράγμασιν, ἵπερ ἀν ὁ λόγος, ἐκ παιτὸς πειράται βοηθεῖν. Taking this as his text, Mr. Wyse points out at every opportunity what the other party was likely

to have said, and not content with this, conveys to us generally a suggestion that, had we but got the speech from the other side, we should probably admire Isaeus' unscrupulous skill the more, while siding the less with his client. In all this the thoughtful student cannot but see an example for other editors to consider. Yet, I must confess to grave misgivings when face to face with Mr. Wyse's results in practice. Did Isaeus never have a case in which the jury might equitably have given a verdict in his favour? Are the twelve speeches preserved to us without exception specimens of what he could do in a bad case? If not, ought we not to understand that in most suits there is an element of justice in each side, and that something not merely specious, but sound and equitable can be urged by both litigants? Mr. Wyse writes as though every speech was throughout dishonest, and, without stating so plainly, hints at every point that the fact was otherwise than it is represented, or admitted of another explanation or complexion, that the law was unmistakably against the speaker, and that he is bluffing the jury or inciting them to override it. Reflexion will show that the most straightforward speeches of the most upright orator could not support so riddling an attack.

It would be impossible in the limits of a review to deal satisfactorily with even a tithe of the questions which this monumental work must raise. It will be best to dismiss it with the unqualified judgment that for years it will be indispensable for all who would refer to Isaeus' words for any purpose, and that its general sanity of interpretation will require a dissentient to justify himself by adducing cogent considerations in his favour.

After thus plainly recording my opinion of Mr. Wyse's work, as a whole, I should like to discuss a few of the more manageable topics suggested by a perusal of the book. Solon directed that a man might τὰ ξαντοῦ διαθέσθαι, ὅπως ἀν ἔθελγ, ἀν μὴ παιδεῖς ὃσι γνήσιοι ἄρρενες, ἀν μὴ μανιον ἡ γήρως ἡ φαρμάκων ἡ νόσον ἐνεκα ἡ γυναικὶ πιθμενος, ἵπο τούτον τον παρανῶν, ἡ ἵπ ἀνάγκης ἡ ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ καταληφθείς ([Dem.] 46 § 14), where it is at least noteworthy that legacies to daughters in place of male collaterals would seem to be always open to attack.

Now, in the first speech of Isaeus we have the case of a man who died *sine prole* leaving a will drawn up some years before by which some distant relatives benefited. Isaeus' clients were less distant relatives who con-

tested the validity of the will. It was admitted on both sides that the testator had intended on the day before his death to make some alteration in the will: the beneficiaries said, to make some obscurity unambiguous, Isaeus argues—very likely, as Mr. Wyse says, διαπονηρεύμενος—to leave legacies at least to his neglected clients. Our editor takes occasion from this to criticize adversely the readiness of Athenian juries to set aside wills on any plausible reason. His comments betray a serious limitation in his outlook. He views the whole question as a lawyer would: Solon's law, its meaning once determined, settles for him the issue. But, as has been remarked before now, the legal mind is not the best suited to deal with great questions: a statesman will seldom see eye to eye with a lawyer. And here the Athenian right to cancel a testator's will was but an assertion of the same right which we in England recognized in the Laws of Mortmain and more recently in the augmented scale of Death Duties. That the interference with wills was not severely felt may be inferred from the fact that we hear of no complaints that Athens gave her citizens insufficient liberty in this regard. Disappointed heirs of course affected to think now that wills should hold under all conditions, now that any and every excuse justified their supersession; but a little experience of the world is sufficient to reveal the fact that even Christians today are sometimes dissatisfied with any will under which they do not secure for themselves the whole property of the testator.

A perhaps better known speech is the fifth, which introduces us to so many of the distinguished family of Dikaiogenes. Without recapitulating the incidents which led to the suit, the reader may be reminded that the issue directly involved was whether a written bond had been duly carried out. One side, for which Isaeus advised, declared that the bond was to be understood in the light of certain oral undertakings, given at the time: the other insisted on the letter of the bond. Mr. Wyse here gets little further than to point out that the other side probably had a very different account to offer of the preceding relations between the parties and to exhibit the openings that there were for that other side to make a reasonable reply. The guarantor, 'Leochares,' says he, 'had a reasonable defence.' He exposes with ruthless acumen the places where we, who know nothing more of the case than the speech tells us, can guess that unsupported assertions are made. The in-

disputable facts are scarcely appreciated that Leochares' principal had first inherited a third of his cousin's property under a will produced by his own father, and then after twelve years had taken over the whole property under another will then produced by himself, and that a jury afterwards found that the witnesses who had deposed to this will (or both wills) had been guilty of perjury. Yet these facts properly weighed must make it very doubtful that the bond, whatever its letter, in the spirit directed that Isaeus' clients should receive their share as out of the now diminished estate instead of as out of the estate originally bequeathed. Were not Mr. Wyse possessed by the thought of Isaeus' chicanery, he would recognize that, even with justice on their side, Isaeus' clients would necessarily resort to some such line of argument as we find in the speech when pleading for an equitable decision on the whole case, and not on the written bond alone. Indeed, so far as this case goes, we may accuse the editor of carrying too far his efforts as *advocatus diaboli*: for he writes to instil 'distrust and circumspection' into our minds; that 'Menexenus IV,' Isaeus' principal client, 'was not a novice in litigation,' but he does not do equal justice to the experience on the other side.

On another subject a controversy has raged since 1877, and it is satisfactory to find Mr. Wyse here with unerring prudence, after weighing all that has been written on the subject, pronouncing against a specious novelty. In the third speech, the issue mainly turns on whether one Pyrrhus contracted a full and legitimate marriage with Nicodemus' sister. According to the speaker, the marriage was not regular because Pyrrhus presented no marriage offering (*γαμηλία*). This fact, he argues, shows that neither is Nicodemus' deposition true that Pyrrhus had the lady properly betrothed to him: she must, he declares, have been simply *άντειρα*. Buermann however thought that he found here evidence for believing that side by side with the legitimate wife, there might be an Athenian woman, *έγγυητή* indeed but only as a *παλλακή*, yet her children legitimate. The theory supplies an interpretation of § 79 neither better nor worse than the orthodox view. 'If', says the speaker according to Buermann 'Pyrrhus had (as is alleged) been induced to have her betrothed to him, he might have been induced also (his passion for her being as strong as is alleged) to present a marriage offering for

her' (*δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι, εἰ ἐπείσθη ἔγγυητασθαι, ἐπείσθη ἀν καὶ γαμηλίαν ἐπέρι αὐτῆς τοῦ φράτερων εἰσενεγκαῖν*). So far as this sentence goes, Buermann might still maintain his view, but the general drift of the speech supports Mr. Wyse's contention that the suggested interpretation of § 79 is 'perverse.' In fact, Buermann's *έγγυητή παλλακή* is simply a *γυνή* under another name. As to Müller's ingenious fantasy that, in consequence of the drain on the population caused by the war, the Athenians from 411-403 allowed an otherwise unknown system of what may be called morganatic unions simultaneous with regular marriages, our editor has no hesitation in pronouncing it unproven; a 'coacervation of hypotheses' is his comment.

Mr. Wyse is, undoubtedly I think, right in entering a *caveat* against the prevailing view, derived from Arist. 'Αθ. Πολ. 42, that the illegitimate offspring of an Athenian father and mother were admitted to the citizenship. Aristotle's words are *μετέχοντι μὲν τῆς πολιτείας οἱ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων γεγονότες ἀτῶν. ἔγγραφονται δ' εἰς τοὺς δημότας ὀκτωκατέκα ἔτη γεγονότες. ὅταν δὲ ἔγγραφωται, διαφῆβονται περὶ αὐτῶν δρόστατες οἱ δημόται, πρώτων μὲν εἰς δοκούντι γεγονέναι τὴν ἡλικίαν τῆς ἐκ τοῦ νόμου . . . δεύτερον δὲ εἰς ἐλεύθερός ἐστι καὶ γέγονε κατὰ τοὺς νόμους. ἔπειται ἀν [ἥτε] ἀποφῆψισται μὴ εἴναι ἐλεύθερον, δὲ μὲν ἐφίσται εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον . . . καν μὲν μὴ δόξῃ δικαίος ἔγγραφοθει τολεῖ τοῖτον η πόλις, εὖν δὲ νικήσῃ, τοῖς δημόταις ἐπάναγκες ἔγγραφεν.* Mr. Wyse, following up a remark of Mr. W. L. Newman's, interprets *ἐλεύθερος* as 'of citizen birth.' He does not notice that Aristotle undoubtedly means that appeal might be made on the question of *ἐλεύθερία* and of legitimate birth. Any one who has made a comparative study of literature will recognize that *μὴ εἴναι ἐλεύθερον* is here the proper abbreviation (to avoid being tedious) for *μὴ εἴναι ἐλεύθερον καὶ γεγονέναι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους*. There can therefore be no question of *νόθοι* who were nevertheless *πολῖται*.

I have intimated that as a rule Mr. Wyse errs if at all, in the direction of undue suspicion of his author's statements. But once at any rate this caution would seem to have deserted him. In 3 § 61 the MSS. give a sentence which no two editors dispose of in the same way, viz.:—*ἴνα οὖν μὴ παρὰ τοῦ ἐπιχύσοντος τῶν κλήρων αἱ λήξεις τοῖς ἀμφισβητεῖν βουλομένοις γίγνωνται, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐρήμων τῶν κλήρων ἐπιδικάζεοθαί τινες τολμώσοι, τούτου ἔνεκα τὰς ἐπιδικασίας οἱ εἰσποιητοὶ πάντες ποιοῦνται.* The editor's

note on this covers two pages and chronicles eleven scholars' opinions. He himself remarks 'the seat of all this perplexity is the thought' and builds his imputation of a deliberately misleading and vague sense on the hypothesis that 'sons adopted by will . . . were ordered by the law to submit their titles to the consideration of a court.' For this he quotes Isaeus *fr. iii. 6* Στυπ. οὐ δεῖ τὸν ἐπίδικον κρατεῖσθαι κλῆρον πρὸ δίκης. But after contemplating the many places where Mr. Wyse declares Isaeus' statements in the complete speeches preserved to us to be dishonest misrepresentations, it is difficult to resist the suspicion that an isolated fragment may be ten times more misleading. Mr. Wyse elsewhere refers to Isaeus 6 § 3, 9 § 3, 10 § 9 and [Dem.] 44 § 19 as supporting his statement of the law: but not one of these passages seems entirely convincing. Six lines of Dobree are here worth all the other editors' lucubrations put together. 'Sensus,' he says, 'ne, cum a

quovis facta esset ἡ λῆξις, liceret τῷ Βουλομένῳ istum in ius vocare, et ab illo in se transferre hereditatem. Anglice, to prevent a man of straw from claiming the estate, in order that his suborner may prove a better title. Nempe, cum semel facta esset ἐπιδικασία, non licebat item possessori intendere, ἀμφισβητεῖν, nisi τῷ παρακαταβάλλειν.'

There are many other questions interesting to the student of Athenian law which Mr. Wyse touches on, but it is impossible in a review to deal properly with them. Even where the reader may not agree with the editor, he is supplied with the materials for forming his own opinion—a not unimportant virtue for a durable edition. Mr. Wyse has, in fact, produced a work which others will be engaged for some time in digesting, criticizing, and incorporating into our schemes of Athenian law; and no greater commendation can perhaps be bestowed upon it.

T. NICKLIN.

#### LIPSIUS'S GREEK ANTIQUITIES OF SCHÖMANN.

*Griechische Alterthümer.* Von G. F. SCHÖMANN. Vierte Auflage. Neu bearbeitet von J. H. Lipsius. II. Die Internationalen Verhältnisse und das Religionswesen. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1902. Pp. vi + 644. M. 14.

THIS useful compendium has already established its claims on the student so well as to be now in its fourth edition. It will therefore not need a detailed examination in the present review.

The present volume falls into two unequal parts. The first, which occupies 132 pages, is a brief sketch of the international relations amongst the Greek states. From an early period we find that there was an 'unwritten law' which states felt bound to obey more or less faithfully: a rule of conduct vague indeed, but yet of great value as evidence of that spirit of humanity and justice, which in Greek life was continually striving for mastery over the turbulent passions of our nature. War was then rather than peace the normal state of society: yet in some respects war was subject to more honourable rules than it now is. Jurists tell us that a formal declaration of war is not required by international law; but the Greeks

thought it to be necessary. Rights of sanctuary existed, and under certain circumstances claim might be made for quarter or the right of ransom; the burial of the dead might be demanded also as a right. The person of the herald was sacred. Letters of marque were issued to privateers; and there was a state intermediate between war and peace, when reprisals might be made on the goods of another stolen, resembling the relations between England and Spain in the West for a part of Elizabeth's reign. One amenity of ancient life must have had a powerful influence for good: proxeny and the rights of strangers. But the most powerful influence of all was that of the great sanctuaries, Delphi, Delos, and Olympia, and the international Games. We see in the course of history continued attempts at union: local political unions, such as that of the Amphyctyons, leading up to the great idea of racial union, which was never to be fully carried out. The space given to this sketch is too brief to allow of its being more than a sketch; but it is well done.

Religion, which fills the rest of the book is treated in the same general way as the politics. There is no examination of the

separate gods, no attempt to trace them to their original, or to sift the elements of their character and functions, or to assign each to its own time and tribe. The religion is analyzed into its psychological elements. After a general sketch of the characteristics of Greek religion, and its relation to the state, topics such as the following are taken in turn: Cult as 'Idolatry,' Votive offerings, Prayer, Curse, Oath, Prophecy and Oracle, Magic and Sorcery, Purification, the Orphics, the Mysteries, Priests and Officials, Feasts, Religious Associations, Clans and Families, Religion in the home, Burial and Cult of the Dead. Each topic, it will be seen, is wide enough for a volume in itself.

In the author's treatment of early or prehistoric religion there is something to seek. He refers to a time when objects of worship were or may have been fetishes, or such things as stones, trees, and animals; he speaks of the sacred precinct with its taboos and the sacred grove: but having gone so far back we should expect him to do more and recall the practice of propitiating the local spirits by leaving a part of their territory untouched, so that, for example, the sacred grove of an Indian village may be part of the primeval virgin forest. Nor does he touch on the part played in local cults by the accidental predominance of a family; or on their relation to ancestor-

worship, which is treated by itself at the end of the book; or on the relation of family and tribal-cults to the Olympians. The sketch of Votive Offerings is most meagre; it is in fact no attempt after a principle of classification, but a mere chance-medley of examples. Hardly less unsatisfactory is the chapter on Sacrifice: the author actually says that to decide whether bloody or unbloody sacrifice be the older on Greek soil is 'von keinem Interesse.' And yet this decided might also decide the question, what race was the earlier on Greek soil, and what was their general conception of the gods. Very few writers seem to realize how vague is our knowledge of Greek sacrifice; not of its meaning, but of the actual facts. It is a subject which cries out for investigation. And if you believe me, here once more is that unhappy cock of Asclepios! (p. 238) The sections on Prayer, Oath, and especially Divination, Oracles, and Witchcraft are likely to be useful to the student. Of the remainder we would call attention to the account of the mysteries and of private worship in the home. The subject of Public Cults and Festivals is too large to be properly treated here.

On the whole we may say that this is a useful book. It will help the student to classify and clarify his ideas; but it is too sketchy to be sufficient for him in itself.

W. H. D. R.

#### BUTCHER'S HARVARD LECTURES ON GREEK SUBJECTS.

*Harvard Lectures on Greek Subjects.* By S. H. BUTCHER, D.Litt., Litt.D., LL.D. London: Macmillan and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904. 8vo. Pp. x + 266. 7s. net.

Of a volume the contents of which are in form and substance alike admirable throughout, it would be superfluous if not impossible to offer any detailed criticism. The simpler object of this notice is to give a general account of its scope and to add a few remarks on some of the points incidentally raised in it.

The book consists of six public lectures delivered at Harvard University to a mixed audience, partly of scholars, partly of the general public, and, with some expansion, printed in the form in which they

were originally given. It is seldom that a series of lectures make a satisfactory book, any more than a series of speeches make a satisfactory political or economic treatise. That this volume is a striking exception to the general rule is partly due perhaps to the character of the lecturer's audience, but mainly to his own skill and tact. They read with all the fluency of the spoken discourse, and yet bear re-reading and study as permanent contributions to the literature of scholarship. Mr. Butcher says in his preface that the book may be regarded as forming a kind of companion volume to *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*—a book also consisting of lectures, which has obtained wide circulation and ample recognition among a circle wider than that of professed scholars. The author's reputation

did not stand in need of any enhancement either as a fine scholar or a lucid expounder. But this volume has a greater elasticity and what seems like an easier mastery. The relief from the heavy burden of his Scottish professoriate has had the happiest results. It is to be hoped that in the comparative leisure which he has now secured, Mr. Butcher may find himself able to add more than one such volume to the sum of his contributions towards the study and appreciation of Greek literature and history.

The six lectures or chapters of which this volume consists cover different portions of a wide field, but have a certain underlying unity in the fact that they are all directed towards disengaging, and bringing out on one or another side, the specific and unborrowed quality of the Greek genius in its application to religion, to life, and to the art of letters. The first two, entitled respectively 'Greece and Israel' and 'Greece and Phoenicia,' deal with the whole theory and meaning of life as understood by the Greek mind in antithesis to those of the two races which stand out from among all the other early Mediterranean peoples in having developed life, the one on its spiritual, the other on its material side. The next is a brilliant study of the specific Greek quality, love of knowledge for its own sake, in virtue of which the Greek race made, for the first time, a serious and not unsuccessful attempt to see life as a whole and to organise it as a continuous and vital structure. In the remaining three lectures, on Art and Inspiration in Greek Poetry, and on Greek Literary Criticism, the Greek mind and method are considered, in a review full of fine suggestion and masterly historical sense, as they manifested themselves in relation to the specific art of letters.

It will be seen that the scope of the volume is thus very wide. It would hardly be possible to indicate in any bald summary the general substance of what is in itself a summary, brief without being bald, and noteworthy for what it discards no less than for what it includes. In reading these lectures one has the sense of perpetual suggestion, of a wider discussion being continually invited or hinted at, yet no sense of anything being slurred or hurried. Such work is in a way the consummation of scholarship: and it is at the same time a guide and a stimulus to the scholars who are working in detail on particular portions of the field of Greek studies, and to those—scholars or otherwise—who desire to understand why Greek life, thought, and art

should be a perpetual object of study, and what they really mean to the whole of mankind.

A fine passage towards the end of the last of the six lectures sums up their conspicuous quality in words which deserve quotation. Mr. Butcher says:—

'The inadequate perception of the correspondence between a writer and his age is closely related to what was perhaps the most persistent defect of ancient criticism—a want of historic imagination, of a faculty for apprehending the whole environment of a bygone time.' The critic, as we now understand his office, is an interpreter between the present and the past; he must be imbued with the historic no less than with the literary spirit. Yet it has taken centuries for this idea to be established. Not until recent years has either Greek or English literature been handled in this spirit. Criticism so practised becomes an art of constructive imagination.'

Many examples might be cited from the book of this constructive imagination applied to passages or incidents in themselves familiar—so familiar that they are apt to pass over the ordinary scholar's mind without making much impression on it. It is in truth this blunted attitude towards the classics which, born all but inevitably of the long-continued study that for many generations now has treated the material as mere gymnastic apparatus, not as a living organism, as a drill-ground rather than as a fruitful field, is one of the principal difficulties with which scholars have to contend, and one of the principal dangers which menace the study of the classics itself. One instance may serve as well as another: take these few sentences from a passage in which Mr. Butcher is speaking of the Greek love of knowledge—that disinterested love of knowledge for its own sake which, whether applied to the outer world or to the world of ideas, rises from, and in its turn excites, perpetually fresh keenness of interest.

'A fresh and lucid intelligence looks out upon the universe. There is the desire to see each object as it is, to catch in it some characteristic moment of grace or beauty. And the thing seen is not felt to be truly understood until it has taken shape in words, and the exact impression conveyed to the eye has been transmitted to another mind. A single epithet, one revealing word in Homer will often open up to us the very heart of the object; its immost and permanent character will stand out in clear-cut outline. Nothing is too great, nothing too trivial, to be worth describing . . . Again, though each thing, great and small, has its interest, the great and the small are not of equal importance. There is already a sense of relative values; the critical spirit is awake.'

What Mr. Butcher says here of the 'single epithet' is typical of the whole of the message of Greece for us. But even in

its primary bearing it indicates a very insufficiently explored path of study; the attempt to see, with a fresh mind and unclouded eyes, the exact meaning of words, phrases, ideas, which through their very familiarity have ceased to arouse any but vague pictures, or have even disintegrated into mere rubbish, the *epitheton ornans*, the tag, the truism. When Nausicaa or Hera is called *λευκάλενος* by Homer, how many of us even pause to consider what the picture is which is meant to be conveyed, still less whether it is one that, so far from being otiose, brings us vividly and closely before the whole aspect of a simple and yet high civilisation? But take a passage from the most Homeric of modern poets which is little more than an expansion of the single Homeric word:—

—My hands are burned  
By the lovely sun of the acres;  
Three months of London town  
And thy birth-bed have bleached them  
indeed,  
'But lo, where the edge of the gown'  
So said thy father 'is parting  
The wrist that is white as the curd  
From the brown of the hand that I love,  
Bright as the wing of a bird.'

After this, at least one Homeric epithet must be for us, as it probably never was before, what Mr. Butcher aptly calls a 'revealing word.' And this is only one instance out of a thousand.

Or again, one may cite, as an instance of constructive imagination, a sentence which occurs almost casually in a discussion of the internal unity which the Greek critics for the first time laid down as a primary requirement in a writing that claimed to be a work of art:—

'And it may be observed that while in antiquity captious critics discovered all manner of flaws in Homer, one defect alone they never discovered—a want of unity in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.'

This sentence, equally true and pointed, 'gives to think' in many directions; whether as throwing light on the Homeric question, or on ancient literary criticism, or on that secular parallax which is both in itself a study of equal difficulty and fascination, and in its application to the classics a necessity of daily use. 'It is no genuine art of words,' says Plato, in a passage quoted in this volume, 'that he will have who does not know the truth of things, but has tried to hunt out what other people think about it.' But the whole of these two admirable lectures on Greek Literary Criticism goes to enforce the lesson that 'what other people think about it' has a reaction, of a very remarkable and subtle kind, upon the thing itself; so much so that the thing itself, at any particular place and time, might almost be described as the integration of what people have up to that point thought about it.

There is not space here to do more than just call attention to one more instance of this quality, in the really brilliant passage of 'Greece and Israel' where the writer touches on the analogy between Delphic and Jewish prophecy, and on the question of 'larger patriotism' in its relation to the national religion which both the Hebrew and the Hellenic race failed to solve in a way that the modern mind has accepted as satisfactory. The prophets destroyed the kingdom of Israel by effecting the dethronement and extinction of its only capable ruling house. They helped at least, though perhaps not seriously—for nothing could have saved it—to the destruction of the sister kingdom. Both for Greece and for Palestine we possess only one side of the evidence. The diplomatic records of Delphi, if they ever existed, and if they had survived, would be as interesting as those of the chanceries of Samaria and Jerusalem.

J. W. MACKAIL.

#### LINDSAY'S 'PLAUTUS.'

T. Macci *Plauti Comoediae*, recognovit  
brevique annotatione critica instruxit  
W. M. LINDSAY. Vol. I. (*Amphitruo—*  
*Mercator*). Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s.  
*Ancient Editions of Plautus*. By W. M.  
LINDSAY. St. Andrews University Pub-

lications, No. III. Oxford: Parker,  
1904. Pp. 152. 4s. net.

In criticising an edition of a classical author it is necessary to bear carefully in mind the purpose that it is intended to serve.

Professor Lindsay's *Plautus*, occupying as it does a place in a series of standard Texts, rightly aims not so much at making original contributions towards the improvement of the text as at presenting for general use the well established results of modern criticism. It is from this point of view that his work must be judged. How far does it represent that text to which the judgement of the competent points as well established or at any rate scientifically unimpeachable?

An editor of a 'textus receptus' of Plautus is in a difficult position. On the one hand he must give a wide berth to all that is merely hazardous in the way of conjectural emendation. On the other hand, if he contents himself with giving the *minimum* of emendation, he runs the risk of presenting a text disfigured by frequent lacunae and bristling with 'loci desperati' — a text which is something less than the reader has a right to expect, and which to every subsequent editor who sets a more ambitious ideal before him is merely a point of departure.

One distinct advantage Mr. Lindsay has had over all previous editors of a complete *Plautus*. The new readings in a number of plays (the *Persa*, the *Poenulus*, and parts of the *Pseudolus* and *Rudens*), which he has the credit of having discovered in the margin of a copy of *Plautus* in the Bodleian, will enable him to improve the text of these plays in a good many passages; and at these points his edition will be an advance on the rival German editions of Goetz and Schoell (*ed. minor*) and Leo. These 'Fragmenta Senonensis,' whatever their precise origin, bear on their face the stamp of being derived from some ancient MS. source and some of them will be a feature in all future editions of the above mentioned plays.<sup>1</sup> They do not, however, affect Vol. I. of the present edition. For the readings in the *Bacchides* contained in the fragments were all known before from other sources.

<sup>1</sup> Those bearing on the *Rudens* I was able to include in my *editio minor* of 1901. It is worth noting that Lindsay is now inclined to think that Lambinus had access to the *codex Turnebi*; see crit. note on *Bacch.* 736. This is very likely, as is shown by Lambinus' note on *Cas.* 414, where he says he used to discuss Plautine readings with Turnebus (prior to the publication of Turnebus' *Adversaria*, 1564–1573): one of the 'libri veteres' so often referred to by Lambinus may well have been the MS. known as the *Cod. Turn.* But as there is no reason to doubt his word when he says that he used *several* old MSS. (now lost, apparently), it is generally impossible to say from which of them any particular reading comes.

The 'whole duty of an editor of *Plautus*' is set forth, briefly in the *Praefatio* to Lindsay's edition and fully in his *Ancient editions of Plautus*<sup>2</sup> — a volume in which some of the fundamental principles of Plautine criticism are discussed, and in particular the relation of the Ambrosian to the Palatine recension. This volume forms a useful pendant to the text, enabling the reader to understand the *modus operandi* of the editor in cases of difficulty. It will be well, then, to discuss it first, especially as one of its cardinal doctrines affects the text in a large number of passages and seems to the present reviewer at any rate open to serious objections. The cardinal idea is 'to adhere to the consensus of *A* (the Ambrosian recension) and *P* (the Palatine recension), unless there is evidence of the scribes having fallen independently into the same error.' This sounds innocent enough at first reading; for *A* and *P* cover all the MSS. of any importance. But what Mr. Lindsay means is that the consensus of *A* and *P* proves a reading to be the 'ipsa verba' of *Plautus* in nearly<sup>3</sup> every case, and that we have no right to go behind a reading so supported except in the case of such obvious or 'inevitable' blunders as all copyists of MSS. are prone to make independently (e.g. modernizations of archaic forms, haplography, etc.).<sup>4</sup> Now this is a startling proposition. Of what classical author can it be said that the consensus of all the MSS. minus the 'inevitable' errors represents the *vera manus* of the writer? Mr. Lindsay has no difficulty in showing<sup>5</sup> that a large number of the *AP* errors are really of the 'inevitable' order and may therefore be explained without regarding the two recensions as based upon a common source. But where an *AP* reading which looks at first sight like an error cannot be explained as 'inevitable,' he boldly denies that it is an error.<sup>6</sup> Here he is on dangerous ground: he has to defend as the 'ipsa verba' of *Plautus* readings like *inde iam a pausillo pueru*, *Stich.* 175 (which may conceivably be scanned, but which is strange Latin for *iam inde a*, cf. *Bacch.* 1207), *penitus egreditur*, *Pseud.* 132 (in the sense of *intus egr.*), *fortasse* taking the *Accus.* with *Infin.*, *Poen.* 1004 f., *in ius uos uolo* (for *uoco*), *Poen.* 1225 : in *Poen.* 1051 he maintains that the

<sup>2</sup> P. 150.

<sup>3</sup> The explanation of the word 'nearly' is given on p. 131 (top); viz. that a few errors may have crept into some very early recension from which both *A* and *P* are ultimately derived.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 112. <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 104 ff. <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 111 f.

*ergo* of *AP* (with hiatus in caesura?) points to a trisyllabic *erego*, though there is no trace of such a form elsewhere in Plautus or any other Latin writer, unless indeed we are to regard *erega* (which he suggests as a 'forma antiqua' of *erga* in the critical note on *Asin.* 20) as a parallel.

In *Stich.* 704 he argues that the *in lecticis* of *AP* (*in lectis* edd.) points to 'some Plautine coinage like *inlectice* (adverb), of the type of *accubuo* in *Truc.* 422'; this new-comer would have to mean 'on-couch-ically.' In *Cas.* 571 he defends *contarier* (for *percontarier*) and *prius*, appealing in support of so intolerable a scansion to a lyrical passage, *Cas.* 839 (where the only change required is to read with Studemund *meus fructus prior est*, instead of with the MSS. *meis fructus prior*) and to *Bacch.* 932 (where other modern editors demand emendation in the middle of the line):<sup>1</sup> *contarier* 'to use the punt-pole, hence to enquire' is supposed to be the uncompounded form of *percontarier*; but is there any evidence that such a simple form ever existed? Side by side with *prius* Lindsay defends *pīus* (though without quoting any passages) and *proprius* (comparing *Capt.* 862), which he says must have had this quantity originally because it is derived from *pro* and *privus*. What has that to do with the pronunciation of the word in Plautus' time? One would imagine that the language of Plautus belonged to some prehistoric stratum of Latin speech. A large number of similar eccentricities are defended on similar lines.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the worst case is *Poen.* 331 where *AP* have got the preposition *in* twice over (*in secundo salve in pretio*); here Lindsay suggests that *insecundo* may be the Gerundive (Gerund?) of *insequor*. This not only yields no proper sense, but completely destroys the balance of the sentence.

But if such things are neither Plautine nor Latin, it must be admitted that there are many errors common to *A* and *P* which cannot be explained as 'inevitable,' and which therefore afford evidence of a certain relationship between the two recensions; unless, indeed, we are prepared to admit that these corruptions disfigured the texts of Plautus as early as the 1st century B.C. Mr. Lindsay's conception of the independence of the two recensions from so early a

date will not, I think, be found to hold water. Nor do I think that he is fortunate in the way in which he has presented his case. There is something inconclusive in his whole line of reasoning. Let us consider the passages which are omitted in one or the other recension. Mr. Lindsay argues that where *P* has less than *A* (e.g. in *Most.* 940-5), then we have a case of omission in *P*, due to the desire to shorten a tedious passage for presentation on the stage; but when *A* has less than *P* (e.g. in *Capt.* 1016-22), then we are to regard the case as one of addition on the part of *P*. Such reasoning depends on the assumption of the very point to be proved, viz. that *P* is a modification of the original text, while *A* is not. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and if (as I fully believe and has been suggested before by Seyffert) the omissions of *P* are sometimes due to stage convenience, precisely the same thing may be said of omissions in *A*. The Palatine archetype *P*, if we possessed it, would be of similar age, character and authority to *A*. At any rate Mr. Lindsay has adduced no evidence to prove the contrary.

It is obvious that a fundamental question of procedure like this is of the utmost importance to the constitution of the text; and I think it unfortunate that Mr. Lindsay has committed himself in his edition to a position held by no other editor of Plautus. It would have been the safer course to submit his new doctrine to criticism before making it the basis of his dealings with the text. In some instances he seems himself to have felt doubts about the genuineness of the *AP* readings referred to above. In his edition he does not venture to print *factis* in *Cas.* 625 (defended in *Ancient Ed. of Pl.*, p. 116), but like other editors accepts the emendation *factu*. But it is ominous to find *prius et* *contarier* printed in *Cas.* 571 instead of the obvious emendation *prius et percontarier*, which by the addition of a simple syllable restores to *prius* its prosody and to the text a familiar Plautine word. I can only hope that in Vol. II. the offending *AP* readings will have disappeared and left not a wrack behind.

An attitude of severe *έποχή* as to conjectural departures from MS. tradition has, no doubt, its good side. This edition is not disfigured by the sort of 'emendations,' teeming with bizarre words and constructions, which used to be fashionable not so very long ago, but which are now generally

<sup>1</sup> In the metres of dialogue *prius* is always two short syllables in Plautus, except at the diaeresis and end of a verse. Hence Lindsay's reading in *Cas.* 378 (*prius quādū*) is out of court. My emendation (*prius et quam mihi*) treats *prius* as = *prior numerus*.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 116-118.

discountenanced. Mr. Lindsay has ruled out a large number of injudicious conjectures, including many of his own.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand his principles have debarred him from accepting or proposing stop-gap readings for filling up lacunae in the MS. tradition, even where plausible suggestions have been offered. Thus we constantly come across passages filled with asterisks, as in the *editio minor* of Goetz and Schoell. No doubt this is because Mr. Lindsay sets up a high standard of scientific probability and is shy of any proposal which cannot be established by evidence as definitely right. For this he deserves all credit. Yet is it not better to supply gaps in the MSS. with conjectures based on the best available knowledge of Plautine usage, even though such additions may not command universal assent, than to give up the problem as insoluble? If they are placed within brackets or printed in italics there is no danger of the reader being misled. For instance in *Merc.* 319, 320, where Mr. Lindsay (adopting Ritschl's suggestion of a lost line) prints

humanum amarest, humanum autem ignoscere est ;  
<humanum> \* \* \* atque id ui optingit deum,  
it seems strange that no one has thought of suggesting

humanum amarest, atque id ui optingit deum ;  
<humanum erravest>, humanum autem ignoscere.<sup>2</sup>

I have a few other suggestions of a general character to offer. (1) Would it not be well in a future edition to make a more sparing use of obelisks in the text? I find them here frequently used in passages where only a slight emendation is needed to restore perfect sense or metre, e.g. *Bacch.* 592. If *negāto ēsse ituram* is 'vix ferendum,' why not adopt one of the emendations suggested in the critical apparatus? To obelize the passage is to mark it as corrupt  $\alpha\pi\lambda\omega\varsigma$  or as standing in need of some desperate remedy.

<sup>1</sup> Of the eleven conjectures (in the plays contained in the present vol.) proposed in his *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation* (1896) only two find a place in the present text: *Aul.* 406 (*Altatae*), *Capt.* 479 (*ad prandium* deleted). Of the emendations proposed in his edition of the *Captivi* (1900) some are here withdrawn: e.g. *Capt.* 201 (*aitis*), 297 (*act* ; but *scio* will also not do: an imperative is required by the sense), 555 *TY.* for *HE.* There are of course a large number of new conjectures in the present text, of which a few words will be said below.

<sup>2</sup> The sentiment seems appropriate, and may well have been derived from the Greek original: it is human to be in love, a thing which befalls through divine influence; to err is human, but to pardon is humane (*i.e.* man's prerogative): reproach me not, etc. In 319 we might read *atque id vel optingit deis*; for *A* according to Studemund has *uel*.

(2) Would it not be well to give up the use of square brackets [ ] to indicate words to be omitted, and to use only the pointed brackets < > for words to be added to the text (e.g. *Amph.* 59)? Words to be omitted can be dealt with in the critical apparatus, and need not be brought prominently before the eye of the reader. (3) I should have liked to see my suggestion<sup>3</sup> that *quin* with the imperative is really an interrogative construction taken account of, by printing some at any rate of the instances with a note of interrogation at the end, e.g. *Cas.* 755 *quin tu i modo mecum domum?* This would, I admit, be a departure from current practice; but it would be particularly suitable in *Capt.* 636 (and *Most.* 815), where this construction is preceded by an admittedly interrogative *quin* with the indicative. Otherwise we have to make a separate sentence of the *ac* (or *atque*) with the imperative, and this is unnatural. (4) I doubt whether it is right to take liberties with Latin orthography by omitting final letters (*s* and *e*), e.g. *nimi'*, *sati'*, *magi'*, *meu'*, *tuo'*, *nemp'*, *perg'*, *hercl'*, etc. Such spellings are merely a means of helping the beginner to scan and rest on no MS. evidence. Yet it is on the MSS. that Plautine orthography depends (not on inscriptions); cf. *Praefatio*, p. iv and *Ancient Editions*, p. 141.

It is impossible within the limits of a review of half the text of Plautus to deal with individual passages except in so far as they show the general tendencies of the editor. The following (not mentioned in *Ancient Editions*) are instances of what I cannot but regard as unnecessary awe of MS. tradition. In *Amph.* 634 the MS. reading *ita quoique comparatum est in aetate hominum* seems to me wrong not only in metre, but also in the use of the word *quoique*.—In *Amph.* 672 editors since Bothe have generally agreed in omitting *quicquam* which makes the line too long, and is unnecessary to the construction (cf. *Bacch.* 504, etc., and Palmer's note). Lindsay tries to keep it by omitting *mihi* (which is necessary to the sense, a Dative being always found in such expressions, e.g. *Asin.* 854, *Bacch.* 504, *Poen.* 466) and reducing *diuini* to the dimensions of two syllables by printing it as *dini*. Surely the addition of *quicquam* by some scribe, who did not understand the genitive *diuini* without it, is 'inevitable' enough. In some passages Lindsay shows a tendency to prefer readings which rest on the evidence of grammarians, to those

<sup>3</sup> 'Interrogative Commands,' *Classical Review*, 1902, No. 3.

attested by our extant MSS.<sup>1</sup> Thus in *Bacch.* 602 he adopts *scutum*, which appears in the *Fragn.* Senon, and is quoted by Turnébe in his *Adversaria*, in preference to the *cui tu* of the Palatine MSS. Palaeographically it is tempting; but does it make really good sense? 'The shield *must be* good for nothing'? The sense given by *cui tu* is far better: 'he must be a good for nothing fellow who has *you* as his bodyguard.' In *Aein.* 547 he adopts *ulnorum* from a var. lect. in one of the MSS. of Nonius 262, for *ulnorum* (*P* and most MSS. of Nonius). What is it supposed to mean? Apparently 'arms'; but there is, so far as I know, no Latin word *ulnus*, and *ulna* is not a word that occurs elsewhere in Plautus. The whole passage (545-555) is untranslatable as it stands in Lindsay's text: a lacuna must be recognized somewhere.

Mr. Lindsay's own emendations are largely concerned with metrical points; and it is difficult to discuss them without raising a number of questions on which I have the misfortune of disagreeing with him.<sup>2</sup> He will no doubt consider me old fashioned; but I should like to say that I have found the introduction and appendix to his edition of the *Captivi* (1900) stimulating and suggestive, even when I could not agree with his doctrine.<sup>3</sup> My own position will, I hope, be clearly defined in the work on Metres and Prosody of Plautus which I have in hand. But there is one general feature of the present text which calls for comment in this connexion. Firstly the omission of the ictus marks, in which Lindsay has followed the example set by Leo in his edition of 1895-96. The advantages or disadvantages of the innovation depend on the purpose which an edition is intended to serve. But apart from the convenience of these marks as a guide to the scansion, one question forces itself upon the critic. Is it not strange that our editor of all men, holding as he does extreme views as to the coincidence of word-accent or sentence-accent with ictus (i.e. with the arses of the feet) in old Latin

verse, should have banished the ictus marks from his text? He ought, on his principles, to have been the first to introduce them, if no one had thought of doing so before; for these marks might have been treated, in strict accordance with his theory, as marks not of ictus but of *accent*. It was just for the reason that Bentley believed in a large measure of coincidence between ictus and accent that he introduced the marks into his edition of Terence. The curious phenomenon of their omission in the present edition is explained in the Preface as due to a desire not to impose on Plautus the appearance of differing from the Greeks in this respect.<sup>4</sup> But according to Lindsay's own theory Plautus *does* differ from the Greeks precisely in this particular. Why has he not availed himself of so striking a method of bringing his own theory home? The reason must be that every page of Plautus contains instances in which the ictus marks raise awkward questions as to their coincidence with accent—instances in which the coincidence is either not proven or contrary to obvious facts. This is a difficult question which cannot be fully discussed here. But there are two classes of facts which demand consideration: (i) cases where the apparent conflict has nothing to do with the question of 'shortening' of syllables: e.g. quite ordinary lines like *Bacch.* 572 (where there can be no question of enclisis), *non maneb*, *neque tu me habebis falso s̄spectum*.—*Sequor*; and less ordinary lines like *Mil.* 502 *nisi mihi supplicium uirgarum de te datur*, and *Rud.* 513 *piscibus* in alto, *credo*, *praebent pubulum*; (ii) cases where 'shortening' under the Breves breviantes law is involved, e.g. *Bacch.* 1106 *Philoxéne salve*, etc., *Cas.* 227 *sed iuxór me exericiat*, etc., *Merc.* 329 *séd óptumé gnatum meum*, etc., *Epid.* 179 *Herculli*. I quote from Lindsay's text: and indeed corruption of the MSS. is out of the question in view of the large number of instances involved. A good recent collection is given by Ahlberg,<sup>5</sup> who finds himself driven (against his own leanings) to admit that in many cases Plautus shortened a syllable which in prose bore the accent.<sup>6</sup> Now in the first class of instances it would be possible to say with Lindsay that 'Plautine metre is quantitative metre, not accentual metre like ours,' and that 'we

<sup>1</sup> In *Ancient Editions*, p. 150, however, he shows that he is aware of the danger.

<sup>2</sup> In *Cas.* 814 his attribution of the second half of the line to Chalinus hardly comes under this category. The difficulty is that it involves dividing the line between two scenes—a thing for which there is no parallel in Plautus.

<sup>3</sup> More than a year ago, I am afraid, I undertook at the request of the Editor of the *Class. Rev.* to review Lindsay's annotated edition of the *Captivi* (Methuen, 1900), after another contributor had fallen through. I fear it is too late now to remedy my neglect, which was due to unexpected pressure of work in other directions.

<sup>4</sup> Praef. p. vi. *Nolui aliam ac Graecis comoediis speciem Latinis imponere.*

<sup>5</sup> *De correptione iambica* (Lundae, 1901).

<sup>6</sup> This Lindsay denies; *Introd.* to ed. of *Capt.* p. 35 f.

cannot look for an invariable adherence to an incidence of ictus which will conform with the accent, but only to a normal adherence';<sup>1</sup> though this admission seriously limits the accentual element in Plautine verse and the statement that Plautus 'scanned as he pronounced.' But in the second class some kind of stress is admitted by Lindsay to be necessary to explain the shortening.<sup>2</sup> How then does he scan the lines? Accent is out of court and ictus he will not have. Thus he is really left without any explanation at all to offer. This criticism has been well brought out by Prof. Exon.<sup>3</sup> In some cases Lindsay silently accepts the readings which involve these scissions, as in the instances quoted above: in others he accepts them with a protest at the foot of the page, e.g. *Amph.* 761 (*dédisse* suspectum), *Merc.* 988 (*hercl'* suspectum), *Men.* 689 (fortasse *dedistin*): in others he attempts strange ways of scanning, e.g. *Asin.* 372 (*imitabōr*, in order to rescue *ādūto*), *Capt.* 321 (*únicus sám*, adding 'suspectum' in order to rescue *décere*); in others he attempts or accepts conjectural changes, e.g. *Cas.* 240 (*senēctan*<sup>4</sup>), *Capt.* 431 (*cauē tu*), *Cure.* 572 (omitting *mīhi*<sup>5</sup>), *Aul.* 599 (*eri ille* for *herile*). This riding of several horses simultaneously will never lead to a solution of the problem. What is wanted is a single method of treatment which will cover all the cases.

I will add a few notes on some other metrical points raised by the text. Lindsay has given up his theory that a naturally long vowel cannot be shortened under the law of Breves breviantes (e.g. *pudicitiam*, *verēbāmini*), though with reluctance.<sup>6</sup> But he still adheres to his doctrine that a short vowel followed by a mute and a liquid never acts as a Brevis breviantes.<sup>7</sup> This position too is untenable; *quadrīngēnti* is too well attested to be put aside<sup>8</sup>; *ōbsecrō uós ego*

<sup>1</sup> Appendix to ed. of *Capt.* p. 373.

<sup>2</sup> Intr. to ed. of *Capt.* § 23 (p. 35), where the conditions for shortening are declared to be (1) a preceding short syllable, (2) accent on a neighbouring syllable.

<sup>3</sup> *Hermathena*, xii. No. xxix. (1903), 'On the relation of metrical ictus to accent and quantity in Plautine verse'; pp. 493-495.

<sup>4</sup> Note that this reading, even if it can be said to justify the short syllable (as due to the enclitic *-n*), produces a false stress on the next word (*ādētate*).

<sup>5</sup> This omission introduces a breach of the dipody law (*Si perges*).

<sup>6</sup> Intr. to ed. of *Capt.* p. 34.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 38.

<sup>8</sup> *Bacch.* 934, 974, 1183, *Rud.* 1324. These MSS. readings are silently ignored in the crit. app. In

occurs *Aul.* 715 (*ego uos* Lindsay with Peters), *Cist.* 453 (which Lindsay treats as trochaic), and so forth. And in *Bacch.* 404 and 1041 Lindsay himself is constrained to accept *pātrēm soddis* and *utrām tu accipias uide*, though not without a sigh ('displacest') at the foot of the page; in *Bacch.* 1167 he tries to get over *probri perlecebras* by reading with Peters *probriperlecebras* as a compound word with short i. But why should not Plautus have treated a short vowel followed by a mute and a liquid not merely as a Brevis but as a Brevis breviantes. Unde illas lacrimae? Cur nobis dispiceat quod Plauto non dispicebat?

In regard to the spellings *quoius* (to denote the dimoric value, i.e. oo or o) and *quoitius* (to denote the trimoric value, i.e. ooe), I do not see why Lindsay calls the former the more usual. The statistics in regard to the whole group (*eius*, *huius*, *quoius*) are given by Ahlberg: the trimoric value is twice as common as the dimoric. Is it possible that Lindsay is speaking of *quoius* alone? But here too the facts are against him (trimoric 20, dimoric 15).<sup>9</sup>

The printing is excellent, and the get up of the book attractive. Only the following misprints have caught my eye: *Bacch.* 570 *paruom* (for *paruam*), *Cas.* 803 *iaiunitate* (for *ieiunitate*); and in the crit. app. *Bacch.* 622 *amens* (for *amans*) and *am.* (for *amens*), 638 (for 637). In *Cas.* 414, the reading adopted is attested by Lambinus as occurring in seven of his MSS., and should therefore not be put down to Pylades. The following are probably not to be regarded as accidental omissions from the crit. app.; its silence, whether justifiable or not, is probably deliberate, the MSS. readings being treated as mere orthographic variants: *Amph.* 199 (*tum*), 658 (*me*), 861 (*cui est*, *cuius est*), *Asin.* 555, 562, 570 (*periur*), *Bacch.* 815 (*eo ipso*), 867 (*neve*), 950 (*interiit*), 974 and 1183 (*quadrīngēntos*), *Capt.* 261 (*illic*), *Cure.* 39 (*euēniat*). In *Capt.* 691 the emendation is due to Bosscha (not Bothe); and Ussing might have been mentioned in *Bacch.* 893 (*Lato*).

E. A. SONNENSCHEIN.

his *Captivi* edition and *Latin Language* he says that *quadrīngēnti* is the older form; but even if this be proved, the form may be pre-Plautine.

<sup>9</sup> I think there ought to have been some acknowledgment to Exon in regard to the method of indicating the quantity by the spelling; see *Hermathena*, xiii. No. xxx. 1904, p. 154. But, as I have said above, the right of an editor to make Latin spelling more phonetic than it actually was is disputable.

BUTLER'S *PROPERTIUS*.

*Sexti Properti opera omnia*. With a commentary by H. E. BUTLER, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. London: Archibald Constable & Co., Ltd. 1905. Cr. 8vo. 1 vol, pp. vi + 415. 8/6 net.

PALEY'S *Propertius*, described by Haupt on its first appearance as 'liber vulgaris ac utilis', has now long been antiquated; and Mr Butler has produced a commentary which will generally displace it in the hands of English students. His book, like Paley's, is a compilation, and neither in illustration nor exegesis nor criticism does it add anything of moment to the work of his forerunners. But the performance has much more life and heartiness than Paley's, and will prove of much more service to the readers for whom it is designed. Mr Butler has made himself acquainted with a great deal that has been written on *Propertius* in the last five-and-twenty years, and has taken pains to set out his matter with clearness and precision, qualities which are seen at their best in his treatment of the question whether ii 29 is one poem or two and whether iv 8 19 sq. are in their proper place. He brings to his task independence, common sense, intelligent interest, and an open mind: not steady judgment, not sustained attention, and not a sufficient knowledge of Latin in general or of Latin verse in particular or indeed of *Propertius* himself.

For example, one does not expect an editor of *Propertius* to alter the text in i 20 17-20 'naulibus Argon | egressam . . . scopulis applicuisse ratem' with the remark that 'the ship Argo . . . could hardly be said *applicuisse ratem*', nor to accept at i 7 16 a conjecture which makes *Propertius* use *euoluisse* in the last half of a pentameter. A scholar is not much at home in metre who at i 10 23 *petuit ingrata* talks about 'the short syllable lengthened in *arsis*' and compares *vincishae* and *ingenuis aut anduit extenos*; or who writes at ii 28 53 (et quot Troia tulit uetus et quot Achaia formas) 'the awkwardness of the order of the words might perhaps be avoided by the transposition of *Troia* and *Achaia*, making both words trisyllables', and expresses doubt about *Troia* as a dactyl but none about *Achaia* as an amphibrachys; or who says at ii 32 5 that to reject *curue te in Herculeum* as unmetrical 'is perhaps to go too far, in view of lines such as 25 9 *at me*

*ab amore tuo*.' To render '*tenui unda*' (i 11 11) as 'shallow', '*excussis lumbis*' (ii 16 27) as 'exhausted', *reludor* (ii 29 4) as 'I am mocked', *curluna labore* (ii 34 52) as 'why the moon waxes and wanes', *solutum ducite munus* (iii 4 8) as 'ply your accustomed task', *nullo facto* (iii 6 21) as 'without any acts of love having passed between us', *moribus* (iii 6 25) as 'manners, accomplishments', *uenumdata* (iii 19 21) as 'won', and '*alio pectus amore terat*' (iii 20 6) as 'torment', reveals unfounded opinions concerning the sense of Latin words and phrases. Knowledge of Latin again is not the strong point of a commentator who thinks at iii 13 56 that the use of the possessive pronoun in the sense of *faustus* has yet to be proved; and resorts to conjecture at iv 2 28 '*corbis in imposito pondere messor eram*' because of 'this extraordinary use of *in*'; and says that *Graeca* at iv 8 38 is 'a unique instance of this adj. in poetry'; and at i 11 30 '*Baiae aquae*' writes 'this is the regular form'—*Baianus* and *Troianus* then are irregular—for adj. formed from nouns ending in *-ius*, *-ia*, *-ium*', and quotes as parallels *Veius*, which is a dactyl, and *Tarpeia*, which was an adjective before ever it was a substantive.

At i 8 36 'quas Elis opes ante pararat equis' I find '*pararat* has the force of a perfect', then a list of references and a remark on 'this curious Propertian use.' *pararat* has the force of a past aorist, and this use is no more Propertian than Plautine. The pluperfect never has the force of a perfect except in the 3rd person plural, as at ii 8 10 *steterant*, iii 24 20 and iv 7 15 *excederant*; a restriction which the editors who accept these readings can, I hope, explain, though they never attempt to do so.

I do not know what to make of the note on iii 13 7, where '*Tyros Cadmea*' is rendered 'Phoenician', or on i 4 24, where *qualis ubique* (such as one finds everywhere) is explained 'sc. of whatever shape or sanctity'. There are other strange misapprehensions of the author's meaning. *moraturis* (which would otherwise have tarried, nisi sedula fuisse) at i 3 32 is translated in a way which leaves no sense to the passage. ii 24 40 'ferre ego formosam nullum onus esse puto' is interpreted, perhaps in jest, 'sc. quia tam leues sunt'. ii 32 3 '*nam quid*, else why': read the preceding lines and try to imagine what 'else'

can mean. iii 1 6 (quoue pede ingressi?) 'pede', an allusion to the metre of their poems': conceive Propertius asking Callimachus and Philitas what metre they wrote in. iii 11 29 'quid, sc. illam raptem etc.'; as if Cleopatra, like heroes and gods and Jove, were the slave of a woman. iv 6 21 *Teucro Quirino*, 'the Trojan Quirinus=Octavian': then who is the British Shakespeare?

Even where Mr Butler chooses, as he much oftener does, the right interpretation, he sometimes seems to be guided rather by a vague rectitude of feeling than by any firm apprehension or distinct perception of the truth. For instance at ii 4 9 'quippe ubi nec causas nec apertos cernimus ictus' unde tamen ueniant tot mala caeca uia est' he rightly sees and states the general sense, and avoids the error of comparing the *tamen* of ii 5 5; but he wrongly says 'there is an ellipse here', and he punctuates the distich so that it cannot be construed. The construction is 'quippe caeca uia est unde tot mala, ubi nec causas nec apertos cernimus ictus, tamen ueniant'.

An editor of Propertius is occupied half his time, or ought to be, in settling the text and discussing questions of criticism. Here again Mr Butler shows independence but not stability of judgment, and a brisk but not a penetrating or comprehensive intelligence. His work, as I said before, deserves much more praise than Paley's; and yet, if anyone desired to stock a museum of absurdities, Mr Butler's edition would yield far more treasure to the collector. But Mr Butler must not bear the blame for this; on the contrary, it is a surprise and pleasure to find that the absurdities are so much fewer than might have been anticipated. His defects are due to his environment: he has the misfortune to have been born in an age which is out of touch with Latinity. Propertius in i 2 9-14 is maintaining the superiority of nature to art: 'aspice quos summittat humus formosa colores, | ut ueniant hederae sponte sua melius, | surget et in solis formosius arbutus antris, | et sciatis indociles currere lympha uias. | litora natuus persuadent picta lapillis, | et uolucres nulla dulcissima arte canunt'. Down to the new Pentecost, which happened somewhere about 1880, no one,—not even Vulpius and Hertzberg, who could understand most things,—could understand *persuadent*. Since 1880 everyone can understand it; but no two persons understand it alike. One scholar says that the meaning is 'litora persuadent se natuus lapillis picta esse'; another that

it is 'persuadent naturam arte potiorem esse'; a third supplies *dulcissima* from below and interprets 'persuadent ut diutius comoremur et commodius acquiescamus'; and now Mr Butler explains as follows:

*persuadent*, 'persuade us', i.e. 'beguile the heart and eye'. The phrase though bold is most expressive. There is no real difficulty in such a use of *persuadeo*, and the emendations proposed [*prae*-*fulgent* is one of them] are neither particularly probable in form nor do they give any improvement in point of sense.

The mixture of mirth and horror with which such notes as this would have been read by critics in the past, and are likely to be read by critics in the future, is an emotion of which we in these times are fast ceasing to be capable. 'Direness, familiar to our slaughterous thoughts, Cannot once start us.' And notes of this sort, common almost everywhere, are common in Mr Butler's Propertius. It is true that he often revolts against the fashion, and says of the MS lections defended by his contemporaries that they are impossible or that they possess no meaning; and he adopts conjectures<sup>1</sup> such as ii 30 8 *ipsa*, iii 2 16 *nec defessa*, iv 8 48 *totus*, whose merit and probability would be invisible to a dull man. But when one reads on, and comes to some other emendations which he rejects, and to some other MS lections which in his eyes possess a meaning and are possible, one attributes his occasional recalcitrancy less to any virtue of his own<sup>2</sup> than to the sudden and violent intervention of his guardian angel.

i 6 4 cum quo Rhipeaos possim condescere montes | ulteriusque domos uadere Memnonias. 'ulterius is used as preposition = further beyond'. Further than what?

i 8 27 hic erat! 'She was here all the time!' Of course she was, or not a word of lines 1-26 could have been written. If a man who had been talking to Mr Butler for the last five minutes should suddenly burst out 'you were here all the time', it would surprise him; because the only people who say such things are live madmen and dead classics.

ii 18 9 sq. illum . . . fuit in ulnis | quam prius adjunctos sedula lauit equos. 'quam prius = priusquam. Cf. Tib. iv 7 8 ne legit id nemo quam meus ante, uelim.' Then here-

<sup>1</sup> The following conjectures should have been assigned to their true authors thus: ii 6 41 *seduct* Birt, iii 18 24 *atrocis* Leo, iv 1 81 (*faltul* . . . *Iuppiter*) Tyrrell, iv 3 55 *Craugidos* Bergk.

<sup>2</sup> At iii 1 27 he rejects the words *cunabula parui* as interpolated, but in a note of twenty lines he does not even mention the one decisive argument which proves them so.

after we will say *qui is for is qui*, and defend ourselves by quoting ii 32 1 *qui uidet, is peccat.*

ii 28 19 Ino etiam prima terris aetate naga est. 'The reference seems to be to her wanderings after she leapt into the sea.' In other words, *terris = mari.*

ii 32 33-8 are printed and punctuated thus: *ipsa Venus fertur* (N, *quamvis* most MSS and editors) corrupta libidine Martis, | nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit. | quamvis Ida *Parin* pastorem dicat amasse | atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam, | hoc et Hamadryadum spectauit turba sororum | Silenique senes et pater ipse chori.

Oenone . . . was a Naiad, and may therefore be correctly styled *deam*. Objections have been raised to the reading *Parin* owing to a misconception of the reference of *deam*. The majority of editors take *deam* to refer to Venus, and then assert correctly enough that Venus had no love affair with Paris. Hence we get emendations such as *Phrygen* (Schrader) and *palam* (Haupt), and the passage is made to refer to the loves of Venus and Anchises . . . 37, 38 *The nymphs and satyrs saw and approved.* Cf. Verg. Ecl. iii 9 *sed faciles nymphae risere.*

Mr Butler has here attained the two chief ends of the modern editor of Propertius: he has stuck to the MSS where others desert them, and he has followed N where others follow FDV.<sup>1</sup> Consequently he is pleased with himself; and his natural elation finds vent in this little sally: 'The difficulty is of the editors' own making.' Most true: the editors have wilfully and without provocation paid heed to the context; which an editor, as Mr Butler proves, is not obliged to do. I neither criticise the meaning he assigns to *spectauit* nor enquire what meaning, if any, he assigns to *quamvis*: I only point out what it is that he has made Propertius say. The subject of the poem is Cynthia's infidelity, which her lover here seeks to palliate by precedents from ancient story. These precedents, according to Mr Butler, are three: the adultery of Helen, the adultery of Venus, and—the blameless and honourable union of Oenone and Paris.

iv 1 81 sq. nunc pretium fecere deos et (fallitur auro | Iuppiter) oblique signa

<sup>1</sup> I do not know what he means by saying 'It may reasonably be objected [to *quamvis* in 33] that we should require *non minus*, not *ne minus*'. *nec* is indispensable and *non* would be inadmissible. He adds 'the presence of *quamvis* might be explained on the hypothesis that *fertur* had been accidentally omitted'; and at iii 14 19, desiring to read *capere arma* with N, he says 'supposing *capere* to have been accidentally omitted (as perhaps in L), *arma* would easily be expanded into *armata*'. I wonder what the patrons of N would think if anyone invoked these hypothetical accidents to save the credit of another MS. Fortunately no one ever does.

NO. CLXX, VOL. XIX.

iterata rotae. 'Now they have turned the gods to profit and—Jupiter the while is duped to blindness by their gold—to profit have they turned the oft-scanned constellations of the slanting zodiac.' It is not possible that Mr Butler should attach any meaning to his own words: he has never heard of an astrologer duping Jupiter to blindness by his gold.

iv 3 49 *omnis amor magnus, sed aperto in coniuge maior.* 'Love is ever a mighty power, but mightier far where the beloved is one's lawful husband'. No student wants to have the verse translated, for its words and construction are both quite simple: what he wants is to be told the reason why Propertius puts into Arethusa's mouth a statement which is both false and irrelevant.

iv 7 69. Andromeda and Hypernestra tell over their sad histories to Cynthia in Elysium: 'sic mortis lacrimis uitiae sanamus amores'. Mr Butler defends *mortis*, but says nothing about *sanamus*; he merely translates 'the tears of sympathy and reminiscence that we shed in the world beyond heal the wounds love dealt in life'. What wounds did love deal in life to Andromeda?

If I wished to lengthen out a series of adverse comments I might examine Mr Butler's notes on ii 3 45, 7 15, 8 31, 10 22, 15 28, 16 12, 28 33, iii 16 19, iv 1 142, 8 60, 9 60. But there are other places where what invites comment is the absence of notes. At i 5 3 'meos sentire furores' anyone who reads the next five lines will find that *meos* must mean *Cynthiae*, which seems a strange sense for the word to have; yet Mr Butler is silent, and silent at ii 19 5, where *nulla* means *ulla*, and at ii 19 29, where *sic* means heaven knows what. ii 27 9: is *flere domibus flamمام Latin?* ii 29 27: what does *hinc* mean? iii 5 6: what does *miser* mean? iv 5 40: does *wordy* warfare leave bites on the neck? iv 7 81: do boughs grow out of the ground? No reply from Mr Butler. In ii 26 31 sq. a voyage over the high seas, 'mare per longum', is signalled by these unusual incidents, 'unum litus erit sopitis unaque tecto | arbor, et ex una saepe bibemus aqua'; then we proceed, with disappointing tameness, 'et tabula una duos poterit compondere amantes, | prora cubile mihi seu mihi puppis erit'. Mr Butler writes 'tabula, the planking of the deck', but of *litus* and *arbor* and *aqua* he says not a word. Here I think he has missed an opportunity: the next commentator will explain that *arbor* means the mast, *aqua* the water-cask, and *litus* the side of the ship, because *litus = ora* and *ora = extremitas*.

Mr Butler seems to share with the majority of conservative critics one of their favourite fancies,—that the chief merit of an emendation is closeness to the MSS, and that conjectures are probable in inverse proportion to the number of letters which they alter. Hence it naturally happens that he adopts some very bad conjectures. At i 19 22 he reads with Aldus 'abstrahat *ei*! (e MSS) nostro puluere', though the classical poets never employ *ei* without a dative. At ii 12 18 he reads with Lipsius 'alio traice *duella* (*puella* MSS) tua'. Think what this means: that Propertius, instead of *bella*, chose the form *duella*, which he never elsewhere uses, in order to make *traice* a trochee, which it never elsewhere is. At iii 9 44, where the MSS have 'dure poet*a*', he accepts *Scriuerius*' *Dore*, and explains '*Dore* poet*a* = Philetas. He was a native of Cos, which was colonised by Dorians'. *Dore* is not Latin for Dorian, nor Greek either; and 'O Dorian poet' can no more mean Philitas than 'O Scotch poet' means Alexander Smith. At iv 3 38 he adopts Prof. Ellis's proposal 'qualis et *educti* (*haec docti* MSS) sit positura *Dai* (*dei* MSS)' and translates *educti* as 'elevated, because they dwell in the northern heights of Scythia.' The word has no such meaning: it would signify 'tall'.

The editor has accepted six of his own conjectures. His proposal to assume a lacuna between iii 15 10 and 11, instead of transferring 43-6 to that spot, is possibly right; and against his conjecture of 'corbis *at* (*ab DV, in N, om. F*) imposito pondere messor eram' at iv 2 28 there is nothing to be said except that it is needless and does not account for the variants. The remaining four are all quite impossible.

At i 21 7-10 he writes 'ne soror... sentiat... Gallum... effugere... non potuisse...; | nec (et MSS) quaecumque super dispersa inuenerit ossa | montibus Etruscis, haec sciat esse mea'. These are the words of a dying soldier whose last thought is of his sister, and Mr Butler thus translates them: 'nor let her ever know that whatever bones she may find on the Tuscan hills are mine'. Certainly the discovery that her brother had 1000 skulls, 2000 femora, and 26,000 vertebrae, would be at once a painful shock to her affections and an overwhelming addition to her knowledge of anatomy.

At ii 17 15 he writes 'nec *lubet* (*licet* MSS) in triu*is* sicc*a* requiescere luna, | aut per rimosas mittere uerba fore*s*', which he renders 'I care no more to lie at your threshold waiting in vain for admission', and says 'nec *licet* is wholly pointless: there was nothing to prevent his going to Cynthia's door to demand admission.' This is the same misapprehension which led Beroaldus to conjecture *nunc licet*. The couplet is severed from its context by 13 sq., but its sense is evident, and is very different from Mr Butler's paraphrase. *requiescere* means here what it means in ii 22 25 'Iuppiter Alcmenae geminas requieuerat Arctos', and the words refer to the stolen interviews of iv 7 19 'saepe Venus triu*is* commissa est' and 15 sq. 'uigilacis furta Suburae | et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis'.

At iii 6 9 he punctuates 'sic, *ut* eam incompitis uidisti flere capillis, | illius ex oculis multa cadebat aqua?' and translates 'Did her tears fall even so when you beheld her weep?' That would be *cum uideres*: *ut uidisti* means 'as soon as you set eyes on her', and will not consort with the imperfect *cadebat*.

At iv 11 53 sq. he writes 'uel cui, *iuratos* (*cuius raso* MSS) cum Vesta reposceret ignes, | exhibuit uiuos carbasus alba focos'. The reader wonders what *iuratos* means, and he will never guess. Mr Butler renders it 'the sacred fire which she had sworn to keep', and then, instead of supporting his translation, subverts it by confessing the true sense of the word, 'lit. by which she had sworn'.

I suppose that this is hardly what would be called a favourable review; and I feel the compunction which must often assail a reviewer who is neither incompetent nor partial, when he considers how many books, inferior to the book he is criticising, are elsewhere receiving that vague and conventional laudation which is distributed at large, like the rain of heaven, by reviewers who do not know the truth and consequently cannot tell it. But after all, a portion of the universal shower is doubtless now descending, or will soon descend, upon Mr Butler himself; and indeed, unless some unusual accident has happened, he must long ere this have received the punctual praises of the *Scotsman*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

## BRIEFER NOTICES.

*Exulum Trias sive De Cicerone Ovidio Seneca exulibus. Specimen litterarum inaugurale quod ex auct. rectoris magnifici in Academia Rheno-Traiectina, etc. By H. M. R. LEOPOLD. Pp. viii + 264. Goudae : Koch et Knuttel, 1904.*

DR. LEOPOLD compares Cicero, Ovid and Seneca in reference to their times of exile. Thus, he notes that Cicero and Ovid, whilst they pay grateful tributes to their native towns, reserve their praises mainly for the Capital; that Cicero troubles little, Ovid much, about the locus of his exile, and Seneca, as a philosopher, has to assume 'exilium nihil esse nisi loci commutationem, rem minimi momenti.' All this takes a whole chapter of twenty-seven pages, and none will wonder, when he finds the investigation in reference to Ovid carried on with a minuteness of which a brief extract from p. 100 will give a good idea:

2° Boreas tam vehementer flat ut aedificia alta subvertat et tecta domibus abripiat.  
(*Tr. iii. 10. 17, 18* quoted in full)

3° Incolae praeter faciem totum corpus pellibus tegunt.  
(*ib. 19-22* quoted in full)

4° Vinum in amphoris congelatur.  
(*ib. 23-24* quoted in full)

Even more heroic is the scale of chapter 7, in which after a perusal of 60 pp. (mainly extracts from Cicero's and Ovid's letters to friends, to a large extent in alphabetical order) we are rewarded with the discovery 'verum esse quod scribit Reichart,' viz. that Ovid's exile did not spoil the mildness of his temper, etc., etc., and Cicero's did. Dr. Leopold's Latinity is excellent and his accuracy unimpeachable; the book itself is by

no means uninteresting. But I do not think that he has contributed anything original to the subject he treats. There is some vigour in his refutation of Bois-sevain's silly remarks on the Apocolocyntosis—but then what right has that work to a place in the chapter *de Fontibus*: how does it help us 'ad (exulantis Senecae) tam facta quam affectus cognoscenda'?

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

*Was muss der Gebildete vom Griechischen wissen?* Von Prof. Dr. ADOLF HEMME. 2e auflage. Leipzig: Eduard Avenarius, 1905. 4to. Pp. xxxii + 156.

THIS book (the editor tells us) was suggested by the widespread belief that antiquity has nothing to teach modern Germany, as remodelled under the refining care of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Yet unfortunately there are in the German language embedded many thousands of words which cannot be understood without some knowledge of Greek. This is even the case in science and industry; so that the editor has asked himself the question, Is it necessary to study Greek in order to understand technical terms? To this he replies No; and that there may be no place of refuge left for those who are fighting with this last weapon, he has compiled this book. It contains an 'Introduction to the Practical Understanding of the Foreign and Borrowed words derived from Greek,' a short Greek Grammar in fact, with most of the Greek words transliterated; and a list of important Greek words, with meanings, each followed by a list of German derivatives, with explanations. Their large number will surprise everyone.

W. H. D. R.

## REPORT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—EASTER AND TRINITY TERMS, 1905.

ON May 19th Mr. ALLEN read a paper on Theognis, in which, while accepting Mr. Harrison's view of the authenticity of the entire collection, he maintained, with Mr. Hudson Williams, the traditional sixth-century date. [The paper will be published in the *Classical Review*.]

On June 2nd Prof. COOK WILSON read a paper upon 'The idea of *κάθαρσις* in Aristotle's definition of tragedy.' Accepting the view of Bernays and others that the metaphor was the medical one of purgation, an analysis was offered of what the main elements in such a metaphor applied to the emotions

must be. It was contended that the essentials of this analysis were in complete agreement with the passage on the subject in Aristotle's *Politics*, and showed that the metaphor of purgation was entirely inapplicable to the true effects of tragedy, and that the attempts of commentators, e.g. Bernays, to give it a meaning of aesthetic value were a manifest failure. Reasons were given for thinking that the formula was not originally applied to tragedy, that this application of it was inherited by Aristotle from others, and that there were possibly indications that he was uneasy about it.

On June 16th Mr. L. DYER read a paper on 'The Olympian treasures and treasures in general,' some points of which had been briefly given in Athens at the Archaeological Congress in April before the section of Classical Archaeology.

He began by advocating the reconsideration of currently accepted identifications on the terrace of the Olympian treasures, and followed one of the alternatives suggested by Dr. Dörpfeld in urging that No. VIII should be not a treasury at all, Nos. II and III should be counted as seen by Pausanias, and the confused text of Pausanias VI xix 5 should be dealt with accordingly, and not as Boeckh dealt with it before such a thing as a treasury had been unearthed either at Delos, at Olympia, or at Delphi. Pausanias saw eleven treasures. The name to be attached to No. III has fallen out of his text, at the beginning of § 5, and his first and chief allusion to the Byzantines' treasury (No. V) has fallen out of the same section at the end. The order in which the foundations *in situ* on the terrace appear to have been laid was, he maintained, VIII, XII, X, XI, VII, VI, V, IX, IV, II, III, and I. All but I and XI were colonial foundations, excepting possibly the unknown No. III. All but I and possibly III were built before or upon occasion of the Persian wars, and I was presumably built to represent a far older Sicyonian foundation. There was much evidence connecting the Olympian treasures in particular with a happy enlistment of local and colonial particularism in the service of Olympian Zeus. Thus a pan-Hellenic consciousness was awakened so that, after the Persian wars, further foundations of treasures could be, as in fact they were at Olympia, completely dispensed with.

Turning then to treasures in general, he intimated that the term *θησαυροί* was on the whole a misnomer, giving rise to misapprehensions only to be removed by a careful scrutiny of the monuments themselves with the inscriptions relating to them. 'Call such buildings *θησαυροί* with Herodotus and Pausanias, use, with the expert antiquarian Polemo, one word, *θησαυροί*, at Delphi, and another, *ναοί*, at Olympia,' said the lecturer, 'or take from Delian and Delphian inscriptions the sacred term *οίκος*: two things are true of all treasures like the Olympian ones,—they are built for worship of a god, they stand for the glory not of any one dynast, but of every member of some one δῆμος.' Strabo's, Baehr's, and Herodotus' views expressed and implied about treasures were also discussed along with W. J. Fischer's Olympian investigations of 1853, and the account of such monuments in Bötticher's *Tektonik*, written before Olympian excavations.

Then followed an account of the various motives assigned by Pausanias and others for the foundation of treasures, and a consideration of their limited use as *θησαυροφύλακτα*. These last properly speaking were entirely different from the Delian, Delphian, and Olympian 'treasures' which should be termed 'communal' houses. Abundant evidence from inscriptions was here discussed and the very clear usage in Delian inventories was appealed to. Reasons of various kinds were adduced for believing that a people founding a communal house had certain exceptional rights and duties in connexion with their house. The consecrated character of all such houses was also insisted upon, especially in connexion with the Plutarchian *De defectu oraculorum* and the 'Lesche' at Delphi, called by Pausanias not the 'Lesche of the Cnidiens,' but the 'Lesche of the Delians,' a nickname for which Pausanias somewhat elaborately apologizes. Various proofs were given in connexion with Polygnotos, Micon, and Aristocles, for making quite sure that what Pausanias carefully describes as an *οίκημα*, ἀνάθημα τῶν Κυρδῶν, and is currently known as the Lesche of the Cnidiens, was strictly and properly speaking the Delphian treasury of the Cnidiens.

A. H. J. GREENIDGE,  
Hon. Sec.

## VERSION.

FROM HEINE.

Es stehen unbeweglich  
Die Sterne in der Höh'  
Viel tausend Jahr und schauen  
Sich an mit Liebesweh'.  
Sie sprechen eine Sprache  
Die ist so reich, so schön;  
Doch keiner der Philologen  
Kann diese Sprache verstehn.

Ich aber hab' sie gelernt  
Und ich vergesse sie nicht;  
Mir diente als Grammatik  
Der Herzallerliebsten Gesicht.

HEINE.

Αστέρες οὐρανίην ἔλαχον στάσιν ἡματα πάντα,  
οὐδέ τις ἦν ἔλαχεν τάξιν ἔβη προλιπών.  
ἀλλ' ἀστήρι αἱεὶ ποιθέρκεται ἀστέρ' ἀγήρως,  
μυριετῆ θ' ἄμ' ἔρωτ'—ἀλλ' ἀτέλεστον—ἔρα.  
μίσγοντες δὲ γέλων ψιθυρίσματά θ' ἵμεροντα  
θαυμάζονται βροτῶν βαρβαρόφωνον ὅπα.  
οὐδὲ ἄρ' Ἀρίσταρχος μονοτύλαβος, οὐ σοφὸς  
ἔσμος  
γωνιοβούτικων, ρήματ' ἐκεῖν' ἔμαθεν.  
ἀλλ' ἔγινε ἔξεμαθον, τὸν Φύννιχον οὐ πεπατηκώς.  
ἔξεμαθον καὶ πῶς τῶνδ' ἐπιλησόμεθα;  
η̄ ζητεῖς δόπονθεν; φαινόμενος πάντας καὶ γὰρ δόηγος  
χρώμεθα—τοῖς λαμπροῖς ὄμμασιν Αστερίης.  
JOHN JACKSON.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

## ΚΛΕΙΤΩΝ = ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ.

In the *Memorabilia* iii. 10, Xenophon enumerates three instances in which Socrates conversed with artists. He introduces this group of conversations with the following statement: Whenever he conversed with any man of those who followed the τέχναι as their vocations, to these also he proved himself useful.

I take it that this group ends at iii. 11, as the business of the beautiful Theodote can hardly be classed as a τέχνη in that sense.

The first conversation is that with the painter Parrhasios. Herein Socrates insists that the depicting of the nature of the soul, in so far as it is expressed in the look and the features, must be one of the duties of the painter.

The second conversation begins thus: πρὸς δὲ Κλείτωνα τὸν ἀνδριαντοποιὸν εἰσελθόν τοτε. Once going in to the atelier of the sculptor Kleiton he conversed with him, showing that it is one of the duties of the sculptor to vary the expression of his statues, both in form and face, to suit the mental and spiritual condition called forth by the particular activity which is to be portrayed.

In the conversation with Pistias, the armour-smith, the thought is developed that a coat-of-mail may have εὐρθμία, if it fits well and so best serves the purpose for which it is made.

The only other conversation in which sculptors or painters are mentioned is i. 4. 3: ἐπὶ μὲν τοινόν ἐπῶν ποιῆσι Οὐρανὸν ἔγοε μάλιστα τεθαύμακα, ἐπὶ δὲ διθυράμβῳ Μελανιππῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τραγῳδίᾳ Σοφοκλέα, ἐπὶ δὲ ἀνδριαντοποιίᾳ Πολύκλειτον, ἐπὶ δὲ ζωγραφίᾳ Ζεῦξιν.

In painting Zeuxis and Parrhasios are mentioned, of sculptors Polykleitos and Kleiton. Who is this Kleiton, mentioned in such company, into whose atelier Socrates drops in this familiar fashion? That he is an artist of mark is evidenced by several facts: first, that the conversation with him follows immediately upon that with the great Parrhasios. Socrates himself states that Kleiton is well known for his statues of athletes. 'That you, Kleiton, make statues of runners, wrestlers, boxers, and pancratists, I see and know.' This he sees, no doubt, in the various statues round

about the studio, and he was aware of it before, knowing the reputation of the sculptor.

The third and most conclusive reason for considering Kleiton a sculptor of some reputation is the following. In the talks with Parrhasios and Kleiton there is an implied censure of their work on the ground that τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἔργα, or τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἥθος, is not sufficiently expressed. The criticism does not need to be formulated in words in order to be felt. If Kleiton is not a well-known and talented sculptor, especially when he is mentioned immediately after the great Parrhasios, the criticism has no force. One does not expect to find soul expressed in the works of an artist of second or third rank. Nor does Socrates go about criticising the output of inferior talent. He may talk with the hetaira, the baker, and candle-stick maker, but it is not upon stony ground that he chooses to sow.

It is from these reasons that I am led to the conclusion that Κλείτων is nothing more nor less than an ὄνομα ὑποκοριστικόν, a shorter form for the longer Πολύκλειτος.

There are three ways, in Greek nomenclature, of forming the shorter name from the original longer name of two parts. Of the two stems, the first and the beginning of the second may be run together: Ἐπαφρόδιτος: Ἐπαφρᾶς. Or either of the two stems may be used alone: Τηλυκράτης: Τήλις, Δαμ-άρμενος: Ἀρμενος. Cf. Fick-Bechtel, *Griechische Personennamen*, p. 36.

It is with the last of these methods that we have here to deal. The historically attested examples of persons who are called by their full names and are also called 'for short' by the use of the latter stem of the compound form, are given on page 35 of Fick-Bechtel. In the *Anthology* of Bergk-Hiller, in fragment 77 we find the maiden Δίκη, who is the Μναστίδίκη of fragment 75. Πολυφράδμων, father of the poet Phrynicchos, in Pausanias, is called Φράδμων, Meineke, *Frag. Com. Graec.* i. 536.

The pet-form of the original two-stemmed name often terminates in -ων. This and the ending -ην are the most usual endings of the hypokoristika.<sup>1</sup> For the ending in -ων I need only cite Ἀδμων, formed from Ἀδμητος; Ἡράκων, name of the father of the philosopher Ἡράκλειτος; Ἀντίμων, which is found with Ἀντίμαχος; Ἀρίμων, which is found

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fick-Bechtel, p. 28.

beside Ἀρίμαχος. Beside γείτων in Ἀριστογείτων the form Ἀριστόγειτος occurs. For a further discussion of the subject I refer to the introductory pages of Fick-Bechtel.

There can be no doubt that the name Κλείτων is a legitimate reduction of the longer Πολεύκλειτος. The question immediately arises whether we have any proof that the Argive Polykleitos remained for any long period of time at Athens, or set up a studio there.

In the case of the Ephesian painter Parrhasios this is evident from the conversation which Socrates holds with him: εἰσελθών μὲν γάρ ποτε πρὸς Παρθάσιον τὸν ζωγράφον καὶ διαλεγόμενος αὐτῷ.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, by the Roman writers he is sometimes called 'Parrhasius Atheniensis.'

There are no inscriptions extant which can serve to connect Polykleitos with Athens. The only notice in the literary tradition which tends to do this is to be found in Aelian, xiv. 16: 'Hipponicus, son of Kallias, desired to erect a statue as a memorial to his father. When some one advised him to have the statue made by Polykleitos, he refused to think of any such votive statue, from which the artist, not the subject, would have the glory. For it was clear that those who saw the skill of the work would admire Polykleitos rather than the man depicted.'

This can be no other than the Hipponicus, the Athenian strategus, who was killed at Delium in 424. The anecdote, like so many of those told in regard to the ancient artists, seems to have little value either from the standpoint of criticism or of history. Despite the lack of information which we have to prove it, it is a fair assumption that Polykleitos, next to Pheidias the most famous sculptor of his time, would have made himself known in Athens by an occasional sojourn there. For even before the Peloponnesian war the artistic activity in that city, fostered by Perikles, had given Athens first rank as an art centre. Nor could the habit of travelling about from place to place for the purpose of exhibiting the fruits of one's labours have been confined to the authors of the period. The case of Parrhasius will serve to prove this point.

We must next consider whether the remarks and criticisms which occur in the conversation with the artist Kleiton will

<sup>1</sup> *Memorabilia* iii. 10. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Acron, upon Horace *carm.* iv. 8. 6; cf. Seneca, *Controv.* x. 34, and Pliny, *N.H.* xxxv. 36, 'pinxit demon Atheniensium, argumento quoque ingenioso.'

apply to the work of Polykleitos as we know him. The general criticism that τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς πάθη, the inner feelings of the subject, must be brought out in a great work of art, is one which can be applied equally to all the art of the period. The development during the fourth century of the art of realistic portraiture in marble, as opposed to the idealized portraits represented by the Perikles of Kresilas, must have had a powerful influence upon the art of the time. To this must be ascribed to some extent the development of that πάθος characteristic of Skopas, and that interest in individualized types which produces the genre work of the succeeding period. The implied criticism of Socrates must be interpreted therefore as a general criticism upon the 'grand style.' It applies about as well to the Diskobolos of Myron as to the Doryphoros or the wounded Amazon ascribed to Polykleitos. The pain of the Amazon's wound does not distort one feature of her beautiful face, nor disturb at all the harmony and symmetry of her exquisite pose.

We must look more closely at the passage: ὅτι μὲν, ὁ Κλείτων, ἀλλοίος ποιεῖ δρομεῖς τε καὶ παλαιστὰς καὶ πόντας καὶ παγκραταστάς, ὅρῳ τε καὶ οἴδα· ὃ δὲ μάλιστα ψυχαγγεῖ διὰ τῆς ὄψεως τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τὸ ζωτικὸν φάντασθαι, τῶς τοῦτο ἐνεργάζει τοῖς ἀνθράσιν; 'Kleito, that you make runners and wrestlers and boxers and pancratists in various attitudes (ἀλλοίος, different from one another), I perceive and know. But what especially touches men's feelings through the sense of sight, namely, the lifelike appearance, how do you accomplish this in your statues?' When Kleiton was perplexed and did not straightway answer, he asked: 'Do you make your statues more lifelike by copying the forms of living men?' 'Exactly,' he said. 'Then by copying the muscles drawn down or drawn up in the body by the particular attitude, those compressed and those extended, those at a tension and those relaxed, do you make them more realistic and more convincing?' 'Certainly,' he said. 'The imitation of the effect which any particular form of activity produces upon the body, gives a certain pleasure to the beholders, does it not?' 'It certainly looks reasonable,' he said. 'And so the eyes of those fighting must be represented as threatening, and the look of exultation in the case of victors must be imitated, must it not?' 'Assuredly,' he said. 'The sculptor then,' said Socrates, 'must copy the workings of the soul in addition to the form.'

We know that Polykleitos, as well as Myron, especially devoted himself to the casting of statues of athletic victors. We have knowledge of six of these: the boxer Thersilochos the Corcyraean; the boy-athlete Aristion of Epidauros; Kyniskos the boy-boxer from Mantinea; Pythakles the Elean pentathlete; a certain Xenokles; and Antipatros the Milesian.<sup>1</sup> These works were all at Olympia. The Doryphoros and Diadumenos can also be ranked in the general class of athletic statues.

This conversation is applicable to the work of Polykleitos in every particular excepting one. Notoriously his statues tended to follow a certain schematic attitude, the pose of the Doryphoros, of the Diadumenos, of the wounded Amazon, of the 'Idolino' in Florence. With this feature of the art of Polykleitos, the *ἄλλοις δρομεῖς* does not at all correspond, especially if it be translated, as is usually done, 'in various postures.'

Quite apart from the present discussion this word has been a cause of trouble and various emendations have been suggested. *ἄλλοις*, often followed by *ἢ* because of its comparative force, means 'different in kind,' and would be a sensible reading were it not for the antithesis, *ὅτι μὲν ἄλλοις ποεῖς δρομεῖς... δὲ μάλιστα ψυχαγογεῖ*. The antithesis here is not at all evident. The simplest and best emendation is that ascribed to Dindorf: *ὅτι μὲν καλοὶ οὐς ποεῖς δρομεῖς*. 'That the runners, boxers, etc., which you cast are *beautiful*, I perceive. But the appearance of life, the realistic quality which especially charms the observer, how do you bring that about?'

With this emendation the antithesis is perfectly clear. The formal, canonical beauty of the Doryphoros is apparently opposed to the *ζωτικὸν φαινεῖσθαι*, which in Polykleitos is confined to the form and does not extend to expressing the inner feelings in the face. From the evidence which I have been able to gather it seems that my conclusion in regard to the identity of the sculptor Kleiton, with whom the editors of the *Memorabilia* have always had difficulty, is a sound one.

W. L. WESTERMANN.

University of Missouri.

<sup>1</sup> Overbeck, *Antike Schriftquellen*, p. 170.

### THUCYDIDES, PAUSANIAS, AND THE DIONYSIUM IN LIMNIS.

THE determination of the site of the Dionysium in Limnis is one of the great desiderata in the topography of Ancient Athens. Upon this depend the many problems involved in the so-called 'Enneacronus Episode.' For in the discussion of this much mooted question there have developed in primitive settlements of Athens—one adjacent to the Acropolis, the other along the Ilissus—two Callirrhoea, two sanctuaries of Zeus, two of Apollo, two of Demeter, two of Gē, but only one Dionysium in Limnis. As ancient writers give us the relative location of these sites, if we can definitely fix the single Dionysium in Limnis, we have the key to the solution of the whole topographical situation.

When doubt prevails in topographical problems owing to the conflicting theories of archaeologists, it is well at times to see what can be learned from a new interpretation of the ancient authorities, irrespective of all archaeological investigation. Dr. Verrall (*Classical Review*, June, 1900) thus attacked the much disputed Thucydides ii. 15, upon the assumption that the sites mentioned are unknown, and sought to ascertain, as far as possible without reference to anything now disputed, the view of the historian respecting the limits of primitive Athens. I wish to apply this principle of interpretation to passages bearing on the Dionysium in Limnis to see whether the literary references are not sufficiently clear and explicit to determine beyond a reasonable doubt the site of this sanctuary.

Our two chief ancient authorities on the topography of Athens are Pausanias and Thucydides. Fischbach (*Wiener Studien*, vol. xv. pp. 161-191) has shown conclusively that Pausanias was thoroughly acquainted with Thucydides and made extensive use of the historian in his description of Athens, so much so that he appropriates words, phrases, and turns of expression found in Thucydides. These stylistic resemblances exclude the acceptance of an intermediate channel. Pausanias had also the benefit of a tradition handed down by local guides respecting important sites. Hence when he makes a statement manifestly based on Thucydides, the presumption is that he understood his authority and interpreted him correctly.

To come now to the statements bearing on the site of the Dionysium in Limnis.

I. Thucyd. ii. 15. Thucydides is presenting proofs that what is now the Acropolis was in primitive times the city, together with the ground lying under it, especially to the south. He first notes that 'other deities (besides Athena) have their sanctuaries on the Acropolis' (Τεκμήριον δέ τὰ γὰρ ιερὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκρόπολει καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἔστι). Καὶ τὰ ἔχον, proceeds the argument, πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἔργαται, τὸ τε τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ολυμπίου καὶ τὸ Πλύθιον καὶ τὸ τῆς Γῆς καὶ τὸ ἐν Λίμναις Διονύσου, φέτα ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια στῆρ ποιεῖται ἐν μηρὶ Ἀνθεστηρίου, ὕστερ καὶ οἱ ἄπ' Αθηναίων Ἰωνεῖς ἔτι καὶ νῦν νομίζονται. 'And the sanctuaries outside are situated toward this part of the city rather, as that of the Olympian Zeus, and the Pythium and that of Ge, and that of Dionysus in Λίμναι where the more ancient Dionysia are celebrated on the twelfth day of the month Anthesterion, etc.' 'Furthermore, he proceeds, 'in the same quarters are other ancient sanctuaries' (ἔργαται δέ καὶ ἄλλα ιερὰ ταντὸν ἀρχαῖα).

Note (1) that Thucydides uses throughout the term *ιερά*, sanctuary, a holy or sacred place, including both the temenos and the shrine or shrines within the sacred enclosure, though at times applied merely to the shrine. This is the regular Greek usage of Herodotus and Thucydides, as well as of Pausanias.<sup>1</sup>

(2) That Thucydides states that these shrines are located in a certain portion of the later city, namely, the Acropolis and vicinity, especially southward.

(3) That in reference to the Dionysium in Limnis he adds that here are celebrated the more ancient rites of the Anthesteria, —ἀρχαιότερα being used to contrast them with the more imposing festivals of later origin, of the Lenaean and the Greater Dionysia.

II. This latter statement is more fully made in Ps.-Dem. lxx. 76, a speech usually attributed to Apollodorus. Here in mentioning certain duties of the wife of the Archon Basileus he adds: καὶ τούτον τὸν νόμον γράψαντες ἐν στήλῃ λαβίνῃ ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν ἐν Λίμναι . . . καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἀρχαιότατῳ ιερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἀγιωτάτῳ ἐν Λίμναι ἔστησαν, ὡς μὴ πολλοὶ εἰδῶσι τὰ γεγραμμένα ἀπαξ γὰρ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἔκαστον ἀνοίγεται, τῷ

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Th. iv. 90. 2 τάφρον μὲν κόκλῳ περὶ τὸ ιερόν καὶ τὸν νεών ἔσκαπτον. Th. v. 18. 2 τὸ δέ ιερόν καὶ τὸν νεών τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. Herod. v. 119 ἐς Δίὸς σπατάλον ιρόν, μέγα τε καὶ ἀγιον ἔλσος πλατανίστων.

δωδεκάτη τοῦ Ἀνθεστηρίου μηνός. 'Having inscribed this law on a stone *stèle*, they placed it in the sanctuary of Dionysus in Λίμναι beside the altar . . . And for this reason they put it in the most ancient and most sacred sanctuary of Dionysus in Λίμναι, in order that not many might know the inscription. For it is opened once each year on the twelfth of the month Anthesterion.'

Note (1) that the hieron of Dionysus in Λίμναι is here referred to as the most ancient and most sacred in Athens (ἀρχαιότατῷ ιερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου καὶ ἀγιωτάτῳ).

(2) That Ps.-Dem. alludes to the same fact as Thucydides, the festival of the 12th of Anthesterion.

(3) That the second use of *ιερόν* is limited doubtless to the shrine, which was opened only on the day mentioned.

(4) That taking the two passages together it follows that the sanctuary in Λίμναι where τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια (Thucyd.) were celebrated was τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ιερὸν τοῦ Διονύσου (Ps.-Dem.).

III. Coming now to Pausanias, we must first of all admit that he does not mention the Dionysium in Limnis by name. Yet he apparently refers to it when in describing the theatre site he adds (1. 20. 3.): τοῦ Διονύσου δέ ἔστι πρὸς τῷ θέάτρῳ τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ιερόν δύο δέ εἰσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ περιβόλου ναοὶ καὶ Διόνυσοι, ὁ τε Ἐλευθερεὺς καὶ ὁ Ἀλκαμένης ἐποίησεν ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ . . . ἔστι δέ πλησίον τοῦ τε ιεροῦ καὶ τοῦ θέάτρου κατασκευασμα κ.τ.λ. 'Adjacent to the theatre is the oldest sanctuary of Dionysus. Within the enclosure there are two temples and two images of Dionysus, one surnamed Eleuthereian, the other made by Alcamenes of ivory and gold. Near the sanctuary and the theatre is a structure,' etc., describing the music hall of Pericles.

Note (1) that Pausanias doubtless had the Thucydides passage in mind. Even Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (*Hermes*, xxi. p. 621), who locates the Dionysium in Limnis outside the city, admits that Pausanias copied from Thucydides, but states that Pausanias here mistook the historian and applied to a sanctuary at the theatre, a statement which Thucydides made about the sanctuary in Λίμναι. Is not the more natural inference that Pausanias is correctly using Thucydides as an authority and that τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια (Thucyd.) were celebrated in τὸ ἀρχαιότατον ιερὸν τοῦ Διονύσου (Paus.)? Certainly the Pseudo-Demosthenic passage serves as a connecting link to justify this interpretation.

Observe (2) that Pausanias here uses *ἱερόν* of both *τέμενος* and shrine, and that *περιβόλος* refers to the whole sacred enclosure of this primitive sanctuary, containing the temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus and the temple in which was the statue of Alcamenes and possibly other structures.

In locating the music hall of Pericles *πλατύσιον τὸν ἱερὸν καὶ τὸν θεάτρουν, ἱερόν* certainly refers to the enclosure, not to a building.

(3) The *ἱερόν* of Dionysus could contain several temples and buildings. We have a parallel instance in Pausanias' account of the sacred precinct of Olympian Zeus. Cf. xviii. 6. 7: *Πρὸς δὲ ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Διὸς τὸν Ὄλυμπιον . . . Εστὶ δὲ ἀρχαῖ ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ Ζεὺς χαλκοῦς καὶ ναὸς Κρόνου καὶ Πέας καὶ τέμενος Γῆς ἐπίκλησιν Ὄλυμπιας.* Cf. xix. 1; xxi. 4; xxii. 3; xxiii. 4.

(4) Our conclusion then is that Pausanias definitely locates the oldest sanctuary of Dionysus, namely that of Dionysium *ἐν Λίμναις* as evidenced by Thucydides and Pseudo-Demosthenes, adjacent to the well-known theatre of Dionysus, on the south-eastern slope of the Acropolis.

The objections which have been raised to the identification of the Dionysium in Limnis with the Dionysus precinct south of the theatre are as follows: 1. That this site is not in or near marshy ground. True; but the danger of forming inferences from the literal meaning of names of places has frequently been pointed out. To add to instances illustrating this, cited by Gardner and Verrall,—Rhode Island is not an island, Oxford was never an ox-ford, nor Washington a washing town; Cinque Ports, in place of five, now embraces seven townships. 2. That the Dionysium in Limnis could not be either of the Dionysus temples lying near the theatre, as one was the temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus and the other was not older than the fifth century. True; but as we have seen, these two temples were within the sacred precinct of the primitive *hieron* of Dionysus. We have no reference to a *ναὸς* of Dionysus *ἐν Λίμναις*, nor to a *ἱερόν* of Dionysus Eleuthereus.

3. That the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* was open only one day in the year, whereas the temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus must have been open at the time of the Greater Dionysia in Elaphebolion and on the days when, as Paus. 1. 29. 2 says, its statue was carried in procession. True; the primitive shrine of Dionysus *ἐν Λίμναις* was open only one day in the year, but the sacred enclosure and the other temples in the precinct, as we

have interpreted *ἱερόν*, could be opened whenever desired.

4. Finally that Dionysus *ἐν Λίμναις* was connected with the celebration of the Anthesteria, while Dionysus Eleuthereus was connected with the Great Dionysia. True; there were different festivals of Dionysus, the Anthesteria, the Lenaea, the Greater Dionysia, celebrated at different times in honour of the same deity under different surnames, but this does not preclude the shrine connected with these different festivals from being in the same sacred enclosure of the primitive Dionysium in Limnis.

In conclusion I would briefly sketch the historical development of the Dionysus precinct. Already in prehistoric times Dionysus had a definite seat in Athens in a stretch of ground just south-east of the Acropolis. This seat was called Dionysium in Limnis and contained the primitive shrine. Possibly its name was due to the existence of stagnant pools in this region formed by streams trickling down the Acropolis slope, which became the haunt of frogs, who proclaim their relation to Dionysus worship in a celebrated chorus (Ar. *Frogs*, 210–219). Here from early times was celebrated the primitive festival of the Anthesteria, consisting of rude jokes and dances and songs. Later during the supremacy of the Archon Basileus (752–682 B.C.), the Dionysus of Eleutherae was transferred to Athens and received a sanctuary in the already existing enclosure of Dionysus. This cult developed in time the dramatic tendency inherent in Dionysus worship, and a circular dancing place or orchestra was formed within the peribolus of the wine-god. Pisistratus embellished the sacred enclosure, erected the first temple to the Eleutherian Dionysus and rendered the crude choral performance more artistic by encouraging musicians and players, of whom Thespis in 534 celebrated the first *τραγῳδία*. Meanwhile the Lenaeum festival had been developing the comic farce (*κῶμος*), and whatever theory we may hold as to the site of the primitive Lenaeum, it is clear that from 499 on (Haigh, *Attic Theatre*, pp. 37, 110) the three festivals of Dionysus were celebrated in the sacred enclosure south-east of the Acropolis—the Anthesteria in Anthesterion, the Lenaea in Gamelion, and the Greater Dionysia in Elaphebolion.

If the sacred precinct south of the theatre is accepted as the site of the Dionysium in Limnis, it follows that all the sanctuaries mentioned by Thucydides are adjacent to the Acropolis, not in the region of the Ilissus,

and thus the problems involved in the Enneacrunus investigation find adequate solution.

MITCHELL CARROLL.

*The George Washington University,  
Washington, D.C.*

RECENT EXCAVATIONS IN ROME.

(SEE *C.R.* 1905, P. 74.)

SINCE my last report no discovery worthy of notice has occurred in the Forum.

The new museum is still in course of construction, and excavation is confined to the neighbourhood of the Arch of Titus, the Nova Via, and the Basilica of Constantine. In the former place, some more traces of the supposed external colonnade of the temple of the Lares have been discovered, and also some remains of earlier structures, of which but little can be made out, owing to their fragmentary character and their differences of level and orientation. One wall in *capellaccio* (an inferior kind of tufa, in use especially in early times) resembles that in the Comitium mentioned in *C.R.* 1904, 141: the joints are not vertical, and the style of construction may thus be fairly considered archaic.

There is also a box drain formed of slabs of tufa, running parallel to the road ascending to the Palatine, which, when it reaches the Sacra Via, is crossed by another roofed by slabs meeting in a point.

But on the whole there is but little going on, and the few workmen that there are do not seem to the casual observer to be exerting themselves to any great extent.

The literature of the subject has not been increased notably, except by an Italian edition of Prof. Hülser's work on the Forum, and the official reports consist of the publication of a single inscription (*Not. Scav.* 1904, 106). But Comm. Boni's idea of forming in the new museum a reference library and a collection of photographs of Roman monuments from all parts of the Roman world is a good one. Such a collection will be of very considerable use to students, if it can combine completeness with simplicity of arrangement. There will, of course, be plans and photographs of the Forum itself, and of drawings and views, from the fifteenth century onwards, relating to it, many of which are of the greatest value for the study of the subject. Comm. Boni's appeal to those who are interested in it to contribute any books,

publications or photographs that have any bearing upon it, has already met with a favourable response, and it is to be hoped that further help will be forthcoming towards the formation of this collection.

Discoveries of some interest have recently been made on the Caelian Hill, immediately to the south-east of the church of S. Stefano Rotondo, where English nuns are building a new convent and nursing-home. A large new hospital to the north-east occupies the site of the Domus Valeriorum (Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations*, 347) and during its construction, in 1902, the house came to light once more (*Bull. Com.* 1902, 74 *sqq.*, 145 *sqq.*). But the building of which remains have more recently been found to the south-east of the church seems to be more probably a portion of the Castra Peregrina, the site of which has hitherto not been absolutely certain. Prof. Lanciani (*op. cit.* 339) is inclined to place them on the site of the military hospital north of S. Stefano Rotondo and the aqueduct of Nero, while Prof. Hülser favours a site to the north-north-west of S. Maria in Domnica (*Forma Urbis Romae*, ii, cf. Richter, *Top.* 337), the marble ship in front of which is by some said to be a copy substituted by Leo X. for that which formerly stood there, and which was an ex votu for a safe return set up by one of these peregrini.<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact, however, the earliest mention of the church under the name of S. Maria della Navicella dates from about 1484, and the 'navicella' itself is ancient, though altered by Leo X.'s orders, his arms being placed upon its base (Lanciani, *Storia degli Scavi*, i, 16, 83). The plan of the newly-found building, which is constructed in brick and opus reticulatum, is not yet complete, and as the excavations have been casual rather than scientific (though all the remains that have been met with have been carefully noted), the whole arrangement will, very likely, never be recovered.

Enough is visible, however, to show that the identification is not an impossible one: but the main argument in its favour is to

<sup>1</sup> Ugonio, *Historia delle Stationi di Roma*, 120, says 'Papa Leone X. . . . vi fece una Navicella di marmo nova drizzandola sopra una bella base dinanzi alle sue porte. La vecchia si vede qui vi appresso mezza rossa, a lato del portico': but it does not follow that he is right in supposing that there was but one ship and in denying the antiquity of that at present in front of the church. Nardini speaks of others in the Villa Mattei, according to the authors of the *Beschreibung Roms* (iii. 1. 491), who saw one still preserved there, though damaged and put on one side: and there is in fact a small one now in the villa, used as a fountain basin.

be found in the character of the inscriptions which have been discovered in the building. In a semicircular space ornamented with niches, which may well have served as a shrine, were found two small altars, and a fragment of a third, of which a considerable portion came out some distance off under a later floor. The first had no inscription, and was entire; the second, broken in half vertically, bore a Greek inscription, apparently a dedication to Pallas;<sup>1</sup> while the third, again broken, was erected in fulfilment of a vow to a divinity whose name is not preserved.

[Mercu]rio? Tib(erius) Cl(audius) Demetrius quod mil(es) fr(umentarius) leg(ionis) xv Apol(linaris) vovit > fecit (cf. *Not. Scav.*, 1904, 272).<sup>2</sup> Fragments of other inscriptions have also been discovered—one, in letters 10 cm. high, on a white marble slab, has the letters [i]ovI o[ptimo maximo], another<sup>3</sup> the letters . . . RVM | . . . PEREGR. while the lower part of another small altar bears the inscription :

CVL LEG  
M · GORD  
IANAE · RESTIT  
VIT

The fact that all these<sup>4</sup> inscriptions have been found in pieces would seem to indicate that the place had been entered by the Christians, and all traces of pagan cults destroyed.

There was also discovered the impression in plaster of part of an inscription which had been used for building material, and which gives the name of Septimius Severus (198 A.D.), a *tabula lusoria* of the usual type (*Not. Scav.* 1904, 296), and two sepulchral inscriptions, one a fragment (*Not. Scav.* 1904, 225), the other entire—a travertine cippus with the inscription :

<sup>1</sup> The text is given in *Not. Scav.* 1904, 365.

<sup>2</sup> The identity of the *frumentarius* and *peregrini* (the latter being the collective term) is proved by Henzen, *Bull. Inst.* 1884, 21 *sqq.* : see Mommsen in *Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Akad.* 1895, 495 *sqq.*, where he points out that it was into the charge of the *principes peregrinorum* that St. Paul's fellow-prisoners were handed over on their arrival in Rome (so *Cod. Gigas lat.*, Stockholm.), he himself being permitted to live in the city under the charge of a soldier—a *frumentarius*, no doubt (*Acts*, xxviii, 16).

<sup>3</sup> The first of these is published in *Not. Scav.* 1904, 225, but the conjecture as to its meaning is incorrect.

<sup>4</sup> It is impossible to tell which legion is meant—either the xii Fulm(inata) the vii, xxiii, and xiv Gem(ina) or the xxii Prim(igenia)—for the name of the reigning emperor was, from Caracalla's time onwards, taken by all the legions without distinction (Marquardt, *Staatsverw.* ii. 455). The first line should be restored [*corni]cul(ari)us*].

◎  
SEX · SELIVS · SEX · L  
EPAPRODITVS  
SEX · SELIVS · SEX · L ·  
NICEPORVS  
SELIA · SEX · L · NICE  
INFR · P · XIX  
INAGR · P · XX

In February I was present at the discovery of three skeletons, two of them buried under tiles, and the third apparently in the virgin soil. The tiles bore no stamps, and no coins were found with the bodies: but one would be inclined to believe that these interments belonged to a comparatively late date in the history of the building, were it not for the fact that they lay under the foundation wall of a line of columns, and also under a drain running parallel to it. The colonnade, however, need not have been erected at a very early period. The style of the composite capitals and bases points perhaps to the third century A.D. Of each of these, three have so far been found: the capitals are 37 cm. in diameter, and 41 cm. high, the bases 43 cm. in diameter and 21 cm. high: while only two columns have come to light, each 2.94 metres in length. Bases, columns and capitals are all of white marble. The extent and form of the colonnade has not yet been ascertained.<sup>5</sup> The discovery of these tombs is of importance in connection with the question as to the course of the Servian Wall, which, inasmuch as the tombs were of course outside it, must have kept along the edge of the hill, not very far from the church of S. Stefano Rotondo (see Lanciani, *Forma Urbis*, 36). A small mosaic pavement, with circles in black on a white ground, was found in a portion of the building not far from these tombs: but in general the pavements have been plain black or white.

The fragments of sculpture that have been discovered are few, but interesting. A life-size marble head, the original of which may go back to the first half of the fifth century B.C., resembles that of the Eros of S. Petersburg (Roscher, *Lexikon*, i. 1355), and was probably, like it, turned upwards, though the sex in this case is not certain. The other piece of importance is a large

<sup>5</sup> Close to them, a little further south-east, a tufa sarcophagus with part of its flat covering slab was discovered, which I saw only after it was brought to the surface. It measured 68 cm. high and 62 cm. wide inside, and one end was broken off, so that the length could not be determined, and nothing was found in it.

plaster head of a bearded Heracles, about three feet in height, which was decorated with colour and gilding, and which, as only the front part of it exists, must have served for the decoration of a wall. Such an object is of considerable rarity.

A considerable number of brick-stamps, dating from the end of the first to the beginning of the third century A.D. (with an isolated example of the time of Constantine), have been found, and a number of fragments of Aretine ware with stamps.

I may conclude by mentioning that further excavations have recently been carried on by the Italian Government in the neighbourhood of Norba, in a locality known as Rava Roscia, on the mountain side above the abbey of Valvisciola. The site is briefly described in *Not. Scav.* 1901, 564 (cf. fig. 1, p. 517). The remains consist of several terraces of 'Cyclopean' masonry of rough blocks of limestone, the lower of which probably belonged to the road leading up to the rest, which being more or less parallel to one another, and not connected by zig-zags, must have served to support the terraces upon which were built the huts of a pre-Roman village. Some of them rise to a height of some fifteen feet. The excavations made here have confirmed this hypothesis, having led to the discovery of pre-Roman pottery, including specimens both of native manufacture and of Greek type. In one place a large number of small votive objects were found, though no traces came to light of the sanctuary the existence of which their presence implies.

THOMAS ASHBY (JUNIOR).

#### POSTSCRIPT.

The appearance of the last four numbers of the *Notizie degli Scavi* for 1904 and of the first number of the *Bullettino Comunale* for 1905 enables me to add some further details. The inscription . . . RVM | . . . PEREGR. is discussed in the latter (p. 109) and completed either thus, [*castro]rum peregr(inorum)*], or, with more probability, having regard to the spacing of the letters, in some such form as this, [*>frum(enteriorum)*] [*v(ices) a(gens) princ(ipis)*] *peregr(inorum)*. The sepulchral inscription of the Selii is also given.

There is no further information as to the progress of the Forum excavations; but there is a preliminary report of work at Rava Roscia (*Not. Scav.* 1904, 407) which is of considerable interest.

The pottery found in the earth behind

one of the terraces, and among the stones of the supporting wall itself, proved to belong to the first Iron Age: and in one place an inhumation burial was found in the space between the back of the terrace-wall and the rock, belonging therefore clearly to an earlier date than the terrace.

The tomb contained the skeleton of a woman lying on a shelf of rock with pottery of the Villanova type, which, like the other objects found in the tomb, shows that it is coeval with the earlier tombs of the necropolis of Caracupa, in the valley below, close to the railway station of Sermoneta, i.e. it dates from the eighth century B.C. (*Not. Scav.* 1903, 342 *sgg.*). A *terminus post quem* seems to be given by the fact that nothing has been found of later date than the fine *bucchero*, of which a fair quantity was discovered near the walls: so that they may come down to the sixth century B.C. In fact, this settlement seems to end where Norba begins (*Not. Scav.* 1901, 558; 1903, 261).

Recent excavations along the Vicolo del Mandrione have brought to light the paving of the ancient road (the line of which the modern lane follows), which runs for some part of its course between the aqueduct of the Aquae Iulia, Tepula, and Marcia, and that of the Claudia and Anio Novus; and on the south-west edge of this road a *cippus* of the former group has been found, bearing the number 71, and precisely similar to others already known (*C.I.L.* vi. 31561).

The distance between each *cippus* was 240 feet, and this, if checked against the position of the two bearing the number 103, which were discovered in 1890, works out correctly. The numbering, as is well known, started from Rome, not from the springs.

#### MONTHLY RECORD.

##### ASIA MINOR.

*Kos*.—A preliminary report of the German excavations in 1904 describes the principal results of the season's work. In the neighbourhood of the Great Temple several architectural fragments, inscriptions, and sculptures were found. Some further evidence was gained concerning the internal arrangement of the building and the position of the surrounding porticos. East of the temple known as c a fresh building (E) has been discovered; it is at the latest of Hellenistic date. In an inner room of this building was a series of statues, the bases

of which still remain ranged round the walls. Further east is the site of Roman baths of late date. The most important of the single finds was that of a youthful colossal head in marble. It is helmeted, and may perhaps represent Alexander the Great. The date of this head, which was found near the Great Temple, is about the end of the fourth century B.C. Other sculptures of importance are a colossal torso of Asklepios, statuettes of Asklepios and Hygieia, and a fine archaic head of Athene of half life-size. About 100 new inscriptions were obtained, including (1) a law of the fifth century B.C. forbidding the felling of cypress trees in the *τέμενος* under penalty of a fine of 1,000 drachmae. (2) Fragments of another decree of the fourth century B.C., which make it probable that the *τέμενος* was originally dedicated to Apollo. (3) Answer of Kamarina to a Koan embassy (date about 250 B.C.). It appears from this that the Koans were *συνοικισταί* of Kamarina. (4) Answer of the Koans to an invitation of the Knidians to a newly instituted festival of Artemis *Ιακυνθοτρόφος* (date about 200 B.C.). (5) Decree of Miletos inviting the Koans to the festival of the Didymeia, which had been changed to an *ἀγῶν στεφανίτης*. This inscription is important for the history and mythology of Didyma and Miletos. (6) Beginning of a letter of King Antiochos III. recommending Apollphanes (no doubt the physician of that name) to the Koans. (7) Decree in honour of a *δικαστραγώγος* (second century B.C.). This inscription sheds light upon judicial procedure.<sup>1</sup>

## ITALY.

*Pisticci in Lucania*.—Several more painted vases from a tomb at Pisticci have been acquired for the museum of Taranto. They include (a) A large Campanian krater of the fifth century B.C. with red figure designs of a youth pursuing two maidens, and of an ephobos between two *ράβδοφόροι* with a pair of *ἀλτῆρες* in the field. (b) A krater with the design of a man wearing a *pilos*, who shows a casket of jewellery to a woman working at the loom in a house. Behind the man stands a youth. (c) A kotyle with designs of Seilene. (d) An oenochoe with design of Eos pursuing Kephalos. From another tomb comes an Attic red-figure pelike of the fifth century showing a lady seated and approached by two servants carrying a mirror and a casket respectively. Several vases have been found which must

belong to a local fabric. They are of yellow clay with linear ornamentation in brown and red.<sup>2</sup>

F. H. MARSHALL.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND NUMISMATIC SUMMARIES.

*Journal of Hellenic Studies*. xxv. Part 1. 1905.

1. J. Six: The Pediments of the Maussolleum. (Seven cuts.) Corrections of Adler's restoration, introducing sculptured pediments.
2. E. N. Gardner: Wrestling. I. Examination of literary evidence for details of contests, regulations, etc.
3. M. N. Tod: Notes and Inscriptions from South-Western Messenia. Publishes thirteen inscriptions.
4. F. W. Hasluck: Inscriptions from the Cyzicene district, 1904. Publishes about thirty (see also Wiegand in *Ath. Mitt.*, *infra*).
5. P. Gardner: Vases added to the Ashmolean Museum. II. (Four plates, twenty-one cuts.) Later R. F. vases and porcelain ware.
6. A. J. B. Wace: Hellenistic Royal Portraits. (Three plates and cut.) List of previous identifications of various heads, with comments and suggestions.
7. D. G. Hogarth, H. L. Lorimer, and C. C. Edgar: Naukratis, 1903. (Three plates, fourteen cuts.) Hogarth's explorations described; pottery discussed by H. L. L., miscellaneous finds by C. C. E.
8. W. W. Tarn: The Greek War-ship. I. (Two cuts.) Combats the received ideas of the Greek trireme; not superimposed banks, but rowers seated side by side, sometimes more than one man to an oar; names *Ἑνυῆται*, etc., refer to longitudinal not vertical arrangement.
9. A. McDowall: Heracles and the Apples of the Hesperides, a new type. (Two cuts.) A Polycleitan type, H. holding up the apples.
10. W. M. Ramsay: Topography and Epigraphy of Nova Isaura. Supplementary to *J.H.S.* xxiv. p. 260 ff.; forty-nine new inscriptions.
11. Notices of Books.

*American Journal of Archaeology*. ix. Part 1. 1905.

1. E. Pais: The Temple of the Sirens in the Sorrentine Peninsula. (Two cuts.) The finding of a fragment of an archaic female head has made it possible to locate the site at Fontanella near the ancient Massa Lubrense.
2. A. Marquand: The Palace at Nippur not Mycenaean but Hellenistic. Plan not specifically Mycenaean, but follows ordinary Greek arrangement; architectural features not Mycenaean but Hellenistic.
3. W. Dennison: A new Head of the so-called Scipio Type, an attempt at its identification. (Plate, twelve cuts.)

<sup>1</sup> *Arch. Anz.*, 1905, part 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Notizie degli scavi*, 1904, part 5.

Publishes a head at Boston; type not individual but generic; probably represents priests of Isis with shaven heads; mark on head not a wound but a cult-sign.

4. B. Powell: *The Temple of Apollo at Corinth.* (Two plates.) Discussion of history of temple and of architectural details.
5. Editorial notes.
6. Proceedings at meeting of Archaeological Institute, December, 1904. (Abstracts of papers)
7. Archaeological news, July-December, 1904 (H. N. Fowler).

**Jahrbuch des deutschen Arch. Instituts.** xx. Part 1. 1905.

1. O. Rubensohn: *Graeco-Roman houses in the Fayum.* (Three plates, eighteen cuts.) Describes houses at Batn-Harit with many interesting features, especially wall-paintings of various deities, and paintings on wooden panels like those found by Petrie; date of houses, second century after Christ.
2. A. Mahler: *Nikeratos.* Discusses literary notices of this sculptor, showing that in Pliny *H. M.* xxiv, 88, *et Demaratum* must be read for *Demarates*, indicating two works, not one group.
3. E. Assmann: *The ship at Delphi.* (Three cuts.) Discusses metope from Sicyonian Treasury (date about 560 B.C.); uncertain whether ship is *μονῆς* or *δέρης*.
4. E. Jacobs: *New information from Cristoforo Buondelmonti.* Shows that this traveller was also a cartographer, and made all the maps of Mediterranean islands in the Escorial.
5. Anzeiger.
  1. Coan expedition of 1904 (R. Herzog).
  2. The Lipperheide collection of helmets.
  3. Meetings of Societies.
  4. Bibliography.

**Mittheilungen des deutschen Arch. Instituts (Athen. Abth.).** xxix. Heft 3-4. 1904.

1. A. Rutgers van der Loeff: *Sepulchral Relief from Phœnix.* (Plate.) Local work, but on a high level, almost equal to the Eleusis relief; date about 460-450 B.C.
2. G. Weber: *Topography of the Ionic coasts.* (Seven cuts.) Sites and remains of Lebedos and other places.
3. C. Watzinger: *Herakles Μηνούρης.* (Two cuts.) Publishes a torso of about 400 B.C. from the W. side of the Acropolis at Athens, where H. Μηνούρης was worshipped; original may go back to Myron.
4. J. Kirchner: *Attic Bouleutae-lists of 335-4 B.C.* (Plate.) An inscription with list of 153 δημοταί and their fathers, arranged by tribes in ten columns; some names new.
5. Th. Wiegand: *A Journey in Mysia.* (Four plates, forty-seven cuts.) A journey from Adramyttion to Kyzikos by the Euenos and Aisepos valleys; much detail of sites and finds (sculpture, inscriptions, early pottery).
6. Ph. Negris: *Ancient Submerged Remains.* Discusses various places which have been partly submerged, where moles still remain under water, as at Rheneia, Leucas, etc.
7. W. Kolbe: *Boundaries of Messenia under the early empire.* New details derived from an inscription at Mavromati.

8. Στ. Ν. Δραγούμης: *Epigraphical considerations. Comments on Rev. des Etudes Grecques, xvi. p. 154 ff. (religious decrees of Arkesine, Amorgos).*
9. Br. Keil: *Literary evidence relating to Pheidias.* Evidence from a Byzantine writer about the Aphrodite Ourania, supporting the statement that it was chryselephantine.
10. *Bibliography.* Finds (Pergamon, etc.). Miscellanea.

H. B. W.

**Numismatic Chronicle.** 1905. Part 1.

H. B. Earle-Fox. 'Some Athenian problems.' An interesting paper on the earliest bronze coins of Athens. A comparison of these with the silver coins of similar types involves, according to the writer, some important readjustments of the chronology. Thus the coins of B. M. Cat. *Attica*, class iv. (earlier coins) must be assigned to the 4th cent. instead of to the end of the 5th cent., and it is further contended that there was no break in the coinage between B.C. 322 and B.C. 220, but that a small issue of silver coins took place and also an issue of bronze pieces. George Macdonald. 'A recent find of Roman coins in Scotland.' Thirteen denarii (M. Antony-M. Aurelius) found in a well at the Bar Hill Fort among miscellaneous débris of the Roman period. Nearly all the coins were cast and made of *tin*. It is unlikely that they were ancient forgeries intended to pass current for money, but they were probably votive offerings—sham coins—of the kind that it was customary to offer to the divinities of springs and rivers. Sir J. Evans. 'Rare or unpublished coins of Carausius.' No. 3 has FEDES (*sic*) MILITVM. No. 8 IMP. C. M. AV. M. CARAVSIVS. A coin belonging to M. L. Naville reads IMP. C. M. AV. M. CARAVSIVS.—M. AV. therefore = Marcus Aurelius, the second M. (according to R. Mowat, 'Mausa') is here interpreted as 'Magnus' or 'Maximus.' There are further some remarks on the legionary types of Carausius. G. F. 'Roman coins from Croydon.' A hoard of at least 2796 bronze coins discovered in two pots at Croydon, Surrey, in March 1903. Two hundred and ten specimens have been kindly presented to the British Museum by the Corporation of Croydon. The coins of this hoard are of Constantius II., Constans, Magnentius and of the Caesar Constantius Gallus, and thirteen mints of the period are represented. The date of its deposit was, apparently, A.D. 351. Full lists are given of the types and—what describers too often omit—of the mint-letters.

**Zeitschrift für Numismatik** (Berlin). Vol. xxv. Parts 1 and 2. 1905.

H. Gaebler. 'Zur Münzkunde Makedoniens.' The second part of this minute study of the coinage of Macedonia in the Imperial Age (38 pp. with 3 Plates). The coins with the head of Alexander the Great—taking the place of an Emperor's head—have been carefully arranged in several groups.—K. Regling, 'Zur griechischen Münzkunde.' On coins of Thera, Bithynium, and Lydia. The archaic silver coins with *obv.* Two dolphins, many of which occurred in the well-known Santorin find, are assigned to Thera.—R. W. Weil. 'Das Münzmonopol Athens im ersten attischen Seebund.' An interesting article on a fragmentary inscription from Siphnos (Inscr. Ins. Mar. Aeg. No. 480, Fasc. V) which can be supplemented by a replica found at Smyrna. This inscription throws light on the policy that Athens, towards the end of the fifth century, adopted with regard to the coinage of the cities subject to

its  $\delta\rho\chi\delta$ —a policy probably effective chiefly in the Aegean islands, though even there carried out only with difficulty, especially after the disaster in Sicily. The autonomous coinage is prohibited, as also the use of 'foreign' money; and all such coins are to be surrendered at the mints. At the same time the use of the coins, weights, and measures of Athens is enforced. Weil further comments on the free use of Cyzicene electrum coins at Athens previous to the year 407-8 when the Athenians established a gold coinage of their own, probably because the Peloponnesian fleet had now made communication with the mint of Cyzicus somewhat hazardous. Weil suggests that two types of Cyzicene staters—the Harmodius and Aristogeiton and the Kekrops—were specially struck for Athens. The Cyzicene 'types' have been considered hitherto as enlarged magistrates' symbols and probably in the main this is what they are. If Weil's theory is correct, I would also point to the Triptolemus stater and the Gaia and Erichthonius as especially Athenian.—J. Maurice, 'L'atelier monétaire de Cyzique pendant la période Constantinienne.' The mint of Cyzicus is always indicated by the letters

$\kappa$  or  $\kappa\vee$  to which are added the numeral of the officina (from  $\Delta$  to  $\Theta$ ), the letters SM (Sacra moneta), and various symbols (star, crescent, etc.).

**The Athena-statue at Priene.** Dr. Dressel (in *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. preussischen Akad. der Wissenschaften*, xxiii. 1905, p. 467 f.) discusses in detail the representation of the cultus-statue of Athena as it appears on the Imperial coins of Priene. Orophernes the Cappadocian king, *cire.* B.C. 158, is generally supposed to have erected the first statue of the goddess in her temple, but it is *a priori* likely that there was a cultus-statue long before the time of Orophernes, and Dressel well reproduces the various fine heads of Athena which occur on the autonomous Prienian coins (from *circ.* B.C. 350 onwards) and points to one of these types (B in his plate) as probably representing the head of a statue of Athena set up by Alexander the Great.

WARWICK WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.

1905.

3 May. W. F. Cornish, *Studies on Hesiod*. II. *The shield of Hercules* (R. Peppmüller), favourable. Fr. Bucherer, *Anthologie aus den griechischen Lyrikern* (J. Sitzler), very favourable. M. Philipp, *Zum Sprachgebrauch des Paulinus von Nola*. I. (A. Huemer). 'After this instalment we expect the remainder with interest.' O. Schrader, *Totentheil* (P. Stengel), favourable on the whole.

10 May. A. Springer, *Handbuch der Kunsthgeschichte*. I. *Das Altertum*. 7. Aufl. von A. Michaelis (A. S.). 'Belongs to the best of its kind.' N. Terzaghi, *Ad Hesiodi Theog. 535 sq.* (R. Peppmüller). R. Ellis, *Catullus in the Fourteenth Century* (K. P. Schulze). 'A careful little work.' Florilegium patristicum digessit vertit adnotavit G. Rauschen. III. *Monumenta minora saeculi secundi* (J. Dräseke), favourable. P. Rasi, *Saggio di alcune particolarità nei versi croci e lirici di S. Ennodio*. (L. Hilberg), very favourable. K. Lübeck, *Adonis-kult und Christentum* (A. Mayr). 'Results good, but polemical style objectionable.'

17 May. Euripide, *Hippolyte*, par H. Weil. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée (K. Busche), favourable. J. Vendryes, *Traité d'accentuation grecque* (H. Hirt), favourable. *Caesar's Bürgerkrieg*, bearb. von H. Kleist (Ed. Wolff). 'Excellent for school use.' Seneca, *The tragedies, rendered into English verse by Ella Isabel Harris* (W. Gemmell), favourable. H. Reich, *Der König mit der Dornenkronen* (V. Schultze), very favourable.

24 May. F. W. von Bissing, *Geschichte Ägyptens in Unrias*. *Der Bericht des Diodor über die Pyramiden* (J. Krall), favourable. H. Winckler, *Die Weltanschauung des alten Orients* (O. Meusel), favourable. O. Berg, *Metaphor and comparison in the dialogues of Plato* (H. Blümner). 'A very useful contribution.' E. Kornemann, *Die neue Livius-*

*Epitome aus Oxyrhynchus*. Text und Untersuchungen (G. Reinhold).

31 May. R. Meister, *Dorer und Achäer*. I. (A. Fick), favourable. Sophokles, *Oedipus Rex*, denuo rec. F. H. M. Blaydes, *Oedipus Coloneus*, denuo rec. F. H. M. Blaydes (H. G.). 'No doubt there is much good and worthy of consideration amid the multitude of conjectures.' *A catalogue of the Greek coins in the British Museum; catalogue of the Greek coins of Cyprus*, by G. F. Hill (K. Regling). E. Petersen, *Comitium Rostra, Grab des Romulus* (A. S.).

7 June. Euripides, *Iphigenia bei den Tauriern*, herausg. von W. Böhme (G. Schneider), very favourable. R. S. Radford, *Personification and the use of abstract subjects in the Attic orators and Thucydides*. I. (Helbing). 'Can be recommended.' J. Samuelsson, *Futurum historicum im Latein* (H. Bläse), favourable. A. Audoulet, *Carthage Romaine 146 a. J.-Chr.-698 après J.-Chr.* (J. Ziehen) I. A Profumo, *Le fonti ed i tempi dello incendio Neroniano* (G. Andresen), 'of excessive length.'

14 June. *Römische Elegiker*, in Auswahl von A. Biese. 2. Aufl. (K. P. Schulze). J. Geffcken, *Aus der Werdezeit des Christentums* (W. Soltau), favourable. *Galen de causis continentibus libellus a Nicolo Regino in sermonem Latinum translatus*, primum editit C. Kalbfleisch (R. Fuchs). 'An excellent work.' J. Bidez, *Notes sur les lettres de l'empereur Julien* (R. Asmus), very favourable.

21 June. H. Riemann, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*. I. *Altertum und Mittelalter bis 1450*. Part I. (H. G.), favourable on the whole. A. Audoulet, *Carthage Romaine 146 a. J.-Chr.-698 après J.-Chr.* (J. Ziehen) II., very favourable. W. Wundt, *Völkerpsychologie*. I. *Die Sprache*. 2. Aufl. Part II. (M. Schneidewin), very favourable.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

*Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.*

*The size of books is given in inches. 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly).*

*Aristophanes.* Graves (C. E.) *The Acharnians.*  $6\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xvi+144. Cambridge, University Press. 1905. 3s.

— Sharpley (H.) *The Peace.* Edited with introduction, critical notes, and commentary.  $9'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. ix+188. Edinburgh and London, William Blackwood and Sons. 1905. 12s. 6d. net.

*Bloomfield* (Maurice) *Cerberus, the Dog of Hades, the History of an Idea* by M. B., Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Johns Hopkins University.  $7'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 41. Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Co. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. 1905.

*Bonner* (Robert J., Ph.D.) *Evidence in Athenian Courts.*  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. 98. Chicago, University Press. 1905. 75 cents net.

*Burger* (Franz Xaver) *Minucius Felix und Seneca.*  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 65. Munich, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Oskar Beck). 1904. M. 1.50.

*Eitrem* (S.) *Kleobis und Biton (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandlinger for 1905, No. 1).*  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 14. Christiania, In Commission bei Jakob Dybwad. 1905.

*Ferrara* (Prof. Giovanni) *Calpurnio Siculo e il panegirico a Calpurnio Pisone.*  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 46. Pavia, C. Rossetti, librario editore. 1905.

— *Della voce 'scutula,' nota di Semantics Latina letta nell'adunanza del 23 marzo al R. Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere.*  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 19. Milano, Tipo-lit. Rebeschini di Turati e C. 1905.

*Gunnerson* (William Cyrus) *History of U-Steins in Greek.*  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 72. Chicago, University Press. 1905.

*Homer.* Blakeney (E. H.) *The Iliad of Homer. Book xxiv. Translated into English prose by E. H. B. (Bell's Classical Translations.)*  $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. 39. London, G. Bell and Sons. 1905. 1s.

*Horacc.* The Works of Horace. The Latin text with Conington's translation.  $5\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 197 (Odes) and 307 (Satires, etc.). London, G. Bell and Sons. 1905. 5s.

*Lechat* (H.) *La Sculpture Attique avant Phidias. (Bibl. des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 92.)*  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. viii+510. Paris, A. Fontemoing. 1904. 20 fr.

*Long* (F. P.) *Outlines from Plato. An introduction to Greek Metaphysics.*  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. iv+95. Oxford, B. H. Blackwell. 1905. 2s. 6d. net.

*Mark St.* Drew (William Prentiss) *The Gospel of Mark. Edited with notes and vocabulary by W. P. D., Professor of Greek in Willamette University.*  $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 133. Boston, U.S.A., B. H. Sanborn and Co. 1905.

*Meister* (Karl) *Der syntaktische Gebrauch des Genitivs in den kretischen Dialektinschriften (Inaugural-Dissertation). Sonderabdruck aus den Indo-Germ. Forschungen, Band xviii.*  $9'' \times 6\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. 134-204. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner. 1905.

*Tibullus.* Némethy (Geyza) *Albiti Tibulli carmina. Accedunt Sulpiciae Elegidae. Edidit adnotacionibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit G. N., Academiae Litterarum Hungaricarum sodalis.*  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 346. Budapest, sumptibus Academiae Litterarum Hungaricarum. 1905. 6 kron.

*Walker* (R. J.) *Septem Psalmorum Poenitentialium versio elegiaca [Hebrew and Latin].*  $5'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 47. London, venit apud Samuel Brewster, Scholae Paulinæ Bursarium. 1905.

*Wiseñ* (Mayne) *Cicer. De scholiis rhetorices ad Herennium codice Holmiensi traditis. Accedunt annotationes in Ciceronis de Inventione libros criticas codicis Corbeiensis nitentes collatione quae adiecta est (Degree Dissertation).*  $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 130. Stockholm, ex typographia Iduns Tryckeri, A.-B. 1905.

## CORRIGENDA IN THE JUNE LIST.

*Cicero.* Dougan (T. W.) *Tusculanarum Disputationum libri V.* The price is 10s. net.

*Thucydides.* Spratt (A. W.) *Book vi.* The price is 6s. (not net).